A DEFENCE OF CHVRCH-GOVERNMENT,

Exercised in

PRESBYTERIALL, CLASSICALL, & SYNODALL ASSEMBLIES;

According to the practise of the Reformed Churches:

Touching

I. The power of a particular Eldership, against those that plead for a meere Popular Government, specially Mr AINSVVORTH in his *Animadversion to Mr Clyft. &c.*

II. The authority of Classes and Synods, against the Patrons of Independencie: answering in this poynt Mr DAVENPORT his *Apologeticall Reply, &c.* and Mr CANNE his *Churches Plea, &c,* sent forth first by *W. Best,* and afterwards for this part of it, under the title of *Syons Prerogative Royall.*

By IOHN PAGET, late able and faithfull Pastour of the Reformed English Church in Amsterdam.

Hereunto is prefixed an Advertisement to the Parliament, wherein are inserted some Animadversions on the Chesshire *Remonstrance against Presbytery*: by T. P.

M DC XLI.
Printed by H. A. for *Thomas Vnderhill*, dwelling at the signe of the Bible, in Woodstreet,
LONDON.

MVSEVM
BRITAN-
NICVM

AN
Humble Advertiſment to the high Court
OF
PARLIAMENT.

Right Honorable, and moſt prudent Patriots;

IT is the divine obſervation of Eccleſiaſtes the Sonne of David King in Ieruſalem, (a) To every thing there is a ſeaſon: A time to keepe ſilence, and a time to ſpeake. Truly it hath ſeemed to be a time to keepe ſilence in ſome by-gone yeeres in England, when the (b) prudent Miniſters of God were neceſſitated to keepe ſilence through the evill of the times, having beene (c) made offenders for a word, as if their doctrine had beene (d) conſpiracy againſt the State, and the land not able to beare all their words. Howbeit for the Engliſh (e) Zion and Ieruſalems ſake, the Lords remembrancers could not hold their peace nor keepe ſilence in ſecret: but (f) entring into their chambers, and ſhutting the doores about them, to hide themſelves as it were for a litle moment, have powred out their complaints and ſupplications before the Lord (who is (g) a God that heareth prayers, and (h) ſeeth in ſecret) waiting on him till the indignatiõ ſhould be overpaſt. But now it ſeemeth there is a time to ſpeake in England, (And (i) a word ſpokẽ in due ſeaſon how good is it?) ſith (k) a great doore & effectuall is opened by a longed-for hopefull Parliament. Oh how admirable it is, even to amazement!

(a) *Eccleſ.* 3.1,7.
(b) *Amos*, 5.13.
(c) *Iſa.* 29.21.
(d) *Amos*, 7.10.
(e) *Iſa.* 62.1.6.
(f) *Iſa.* 26.20.
(g) *Pſal.* 65.2.
(h) *Math.* 6.6.
(i) *Prov.* 15.23.
(k) 1. *Cor.* 16.9.

that the hearts and tongues of the people of God throughout the Engliſh nation, have beene ſo graci-
(l) *Hoſ.* 14.2. ouſly enlarged (l) in taking words with them, (not on-
(m) *Zach.* 12.12, 13,14. ly (m) in their humiliations apart in families, but alſo)
(n) 2.*Chron.* 20. 3.4. on the dayes (n) appointed by authority for ſolemne prayer & faſting; to (o) ſeeke a right way for themſel-
(o) *Ezr.*8.21. ves, and for their litle ones, and for all their ſubſtance;
(p) *Amos*,7.5. ſpeaking and crying unto the Lord, (p) Ceaſe we beſeech thee, by whom ſhall Engliſh Iacob ariſe? for he is ſmall. Yea, and is it not exceedingly marvellous al-
(q) *Act.*17.16. ſo? how after ſupplicating God in ſuch ſort, their (q) Spirits were ſtirred in them to ſpeake to your Honors of the cure-all-court of Parliament in their manifold Petitions for Reformatiõ, contributing votes by thou-
(r) 1.*Cor.*16.9. ſands of ſeverall Counties. And what though (r) there be many adverſaries that doe murmur and repine at
(ſ) *Luk.*19.39,40. thoſe (ſ) wel-approved zelots? May it not be thought that if they had held their peace, the ſtones would immediately have cryed out?

The bleſſed tidings of this reviving ſtate of Engliſh affaires ſpreading abroad in ſundry countreys, is come
(t) *Prov.*25.25. alſo into the Vnited Netherlands, to refreſh (as (t) good news is wont from a farre countrey) ſuch of us of the Engliſh nation, who have been enforced by home-oppreſſions to ſeeke for liberty, imployment and liveli-
(v) 2.*Chro.*11.13, 14. hood (as the (v) Prieſts & Levites in Iſrael did on ſomwhat the like occaſion) who yet in our meaſure (x) re-
(x) *Ier.*51.50. *Pſal.*137.5,6. member the Lord afarre of, not daring through forgetfulnes to let goe out of minde our moſt endeared na-
(y) *Pſal.* 122.6,9. tive countrey. (y) Let them proſper that love and ſeeke the welfare of England.

Hence your Honors moſt humble adverti ſer con-
(z) 2.*King.*7.9. vinced of not (z) doing well to remaine altogether ſilẽt,

rea-

readily tooke hold on the opportunity of the ensuing treatise (as [a] Zacheus climbed up into a Sycomore tree to see his Saviour, because of the presse, and litlenes of his stature) to insert a word, to be as [b] the widows farthing, some addition to the great stock of more able qualified seekers of Reformation.

(a) *Luk.* 19.3,4.

(b) *Mark.* 12.42.

Most noble and right worthy Sirs; It were much to have beene wished, t'had never beene [c] told in Gath, that the [d] godly men have ceased, and the faithfull failed in England: Woe is us, tis too notoriously knowne, how that divers worthies of the Lord of b. m. [e] the chariots and horsmen of the English Israel, who by [f] the christalline streames of pure doctrine made glad the citty of God, had their [g] untimely deaths hastened by sharpe tempests of persecution raised against them by the Hierarchie through their Summoning, Traducing, Reproching, Suspending, Excommunicating, Depriving, Fining, Imprisoning, & trampling on them as unsavory salt, or as broken and despised vessels cast to the wals. Others have beene constrained to provide for their breathing as they could by removing into forraine parts, after much suffering at home, and thereby exposed to the bitter miseries [h] of wanderers, being debarred of the pleasant land of their nativity, ancient habitations, naturall kinred, familiar acquaintance, meanes of subsistance, accustomed aire, and wonted manners of people; and instead thereof [i] cast into a land of strangers, and of a strange language, as a greater aggravation of their most disconsolate condition. Yea & [k] all this come upon them, onely for their [l] endeavoring to keepe consciences void of offence towards God, & towards men; in refusall of conformity to some superstitious ceremonies, & subscription to the Canon (albeit

(c) *2.Sam.* 1.20.

(d) *Psal.* 12.1. *Mic.* 7.1,2.

(e) *2.King.* 2.12.

(f) *Psal.* 46.4.

(g) *Reve.* 11.7.

(h) *Psal.* 56.8. *Isa.* 16.3,4.

(i) *Ezek.* 3.5,6.

(k) *Psal.* 44.17.

(l) *Act.* 24.16.

* *Stat. Q. Eliz. 13. 12.*

beit they never refuſed to ſubſcribe according to * the law of the land) whereas otherwiſe they were orthodoxe and painfull in their miniſtery, and unblamable in their converſation, approving themſelves to the (m) conſciences of their adverſaries. Moreover they were ſuch as highly prized the Church-aſſemblies of England, and diligently frequented and joyned in the ſolemne adminiſtration of the word, Sacraments, and prayers, ſo farre as they could free themſelves from their owne perſonall pollutions and defilements, as (n) our Lord Chriſt directeth in ſuch caſe.

(m) *2. Cor. 4. 2.*

(n) *Mat. 23. 1, 2, 3.*

A true report of ſome Prelaticall proceedings in Cheſter Dioceſſe.

May it pleaſe your Honors to receive a hint of ſome Prelaticall proceedings, exemplified moſtly in the particular of your humble advertiſer; who was called to the work of miniſtery many yeeres agone in ſuch place of Cheſter Dioceſſe, where he could execute his function, without ſuch officiating as is uſually required of incumbents, that take the Cure in Pariſhes. In proceſſe of time * D. Morton became Prelate, who taking knowledge of divers Non-conformiſts in this Dioceſſe, † ſent out letters miſſive to ſummon ſome of them to the high Commiſſion Court then kept at Cheſter. Which being divulged, it pleaſed God to ſtirre up ſome of the eminent & wel-affected Knights & Eſquires inhabiting in that Dioceſſe, to conſult & agree together to write a letter to the Biſhop in theſe words; * Right „ Reverend, &c. Whereas wee underſtand that divers „ of our painfull and diſcreet Miniſters, are lately by „ letters miſſive from your L. & others of his Majeſties „ high Commiſſion for cauſes Eccleſiaſticall within the „ Dioceſſe of Cheſter, enjoyned to appeare before „ you, to anſwer to ſuch matters as ſhalbe objected a„ gainſt them: We have thought fitting to acquaint your

* *Now* B. *of Durham.*

† *H. Commiſſion pretended ag. Papiſts in Lancaſhire cheifly bent ag. refuſers of ſuperſtitious ceremonies.*

* *A copie of a letter ſent to the* B. *of Ch. from ſome worthy gentlemen of the dioces, in behalfe of ſome non-conformiſts.*

„ your L. with our opinions of theſe our Miniſters,
„ whoſe names are ſubſcribed, for the better prevẽting
„ (if need require) of ſuch ſiniſter and malitious infor-
„ mations, which in theſe caſes are frequently ſtirred up
„ againſt men of their ſort & quality, ſomtimes by lewd
„ & profane perſons remaining in our owne Church,
„ & many times by the diſguiſed, ſubtill, & ſuperſtiti-
„ ous Romaniſts, & Church-papiſts; whoſe hearts are
„ wholly againſt us, all the while their faces are ſee-
„ mingly with us. Firſt therfore we have obſerved (ſoe
„ farre as we are able to judge) in theſe our Miniſters,
„ Integrity of life & converſation, orthodoxall ſound-
„ nes of doctrine in their teaching, diligence & painful-
„ nes in their places; ſobriety, & peaceablenes in their
„ diſpoſitions, free from factiouſnes. In regard wherof,
„ as alſo the great good and profit which our Congre-
„ gations where they remaine have abundantly re-
„ ceived from their miniſtery; we are emboldned eft-
„ ſoones to intreat, &c. The letter was delivered to the B. at * Stocport, who having read it, let fall theſe words. They whom the letter concerneth are the worſe to be liked, for the good teſtimony the Gentlemen give of them: And then ſpeaking to me, (being one of the Subſcribed in the letter) required a propoſall of any argument againſt the uſe of the Croſſe in Baptiſme; that ſo he might inſtantly diſcover (as he boaſtingly ſpake) our weaknes and folly in refuſing to conforme. But I deſired to decline diſputes with him, partly ſith my errand at that time was to obteine his favour for releaſe from the High C. Court, if it might be procured; and partly ſith He vvas to be the chiefe judge in our cauſe, which might prove prejudiciall to us in caſe of a de-

* *The* B. *had beſides his Biſhoprick the Parſonage of Stocport, being the greateſt benefice in all Cheſhire.*

denyed dimiſſion. Nevertheles when he preſſed his demand in the preſence of many perſons of quality (leſt I ſhould ſeeme to betray a good cauſe in being unwilling or * unready to give anſwer, when a reaſon of my profeſſion vvas aſked) I propounded an argumēt, ſtating it according to the faireſt pretence of urging the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, even as the Canon interpreteth the uſe of it: *For the dedicating of the party baptiſed to God.* Whence I proved that the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme was ſuperſtitious, ſith ſuch dedication ſignified by it, is an uſurpatiō of an office beſides divine inſtitution, & conſequently unlawfull, as * by two texts of Scripture alledged & applied I did evince. After ſome debate about this argument, & of a non-ſenſe diſtinction uſed by him, viz. A dedication of conſecration, and a dedication of proteſtation, &c. He then ſaid, he could not beleeve that the Canon was ſo explaned, & therfore ſent for the booke of Canōs; but being therby further convinced, & not knowing what to anſwer, he paſſionatly wiſhed, that either it had beene otherwiſe expreſſed, or that noe explanation had beene added to the Canon. In fine he ingenuouſly acknowledged his former neglect to ſtudy theſe controverſies, having hitherto eſteemed lightly of them; yet ſith occaſion ſeemed to require, he now reſolved to apply his ſtudies a while this way. Heerupon he was pleaſed to undertake our diſmiſſion from the H. C. C. till he ſhould firſt have aſſayed to winne us to conformity in a ſcholaſticall way, ſith he diſcerned in us (as he ſaid) ſome ſcholerſhip above his expectation. At the ſame time he ordered us, ſeverally to ſet downe in writing within the ſpace of the moneth following (& then to bring to him) 3 * arguments, againſt the Croſſe in Baptiſme,

* 1. *Pet.* 3. 15.

* *Levit.* 10. 1, 2. *Galat.* 1. 8, 9.

* *The B. would not diſpute at all about the greateſt grievāce of the Non-conformiſts, viz. intollerable ſubſcription unto 5 books in ſeverall points queſtionable and faulty.*

tiſme, the Surpliſſe in divine ſervice, & kneeling at the Lords ſupper. His order was accordingly obſerved, albeit a deſired ſucceſſe failed. For ſome of us ſhortly after were againe ſummoned by letters miſſive, to the H. C. Court, & then dealt with in a vexatious ſort. I was compelled to travell 30 miles from my dwelling, three ſeverall times in 14 daies. On one of theſe Court daies M. Nichols of b. m. a moſt pious and learned Miniſter, being required to give an accompt of his arguments he had delivered to the B. was in open Court by the B. & D. Snell ſcornfully taunted & giered, as if what he had written was raw, and ſhould therfore be roſted, when they were not able to gainſay the wiſedome & Spirit, by which he ſpake. At the ſame time (I having beene immediately before ſharply ſpoken unto by the B. and Commiſſioners, & deferred to the Court for the weeke following) one of the B^{s} cheife * Gentlemen, accompanied with two Popiſh Gentlemen, belonging to a great Earle then in Cheſter, plucked me a litle aſide, & did idly & diſdainfully upbraid me of ſimplicity, & reproch me as if I were conjuring, becauſe I looked to the ground, & anſwered nothing; they therfore alſo concluded I ſhould goe to Hell, ſith my looks ſeemed thitherward. Such their vile language uttered likewiſe with blaſphemours ſwearing & curſing, in the hearing of many thronging about us, occaſioned a Gentleman that was preſent to complaine of their uncivill behaviour, & in humane cariage: whereupō they being much inraged, thruſt him on the ſuddaine to the doore of the palace, and caſt him headlong dovvne the ſtaires, to the endangering of his life. When the Court was riſen the B. was privatly informed of his mans inſolencies, who ſeemed to be ſomwhat diſcontented towards him; yet

* *Prelates have gentlemen to wait on them, but they are ſuch for the moſt part, as are notoriouſly debauched, as is commonly obſerved.*

ſaid,

sayd, that vvhat his servant had disorderly done could be noe disparagment to him, that was his master. At my comming to Chester the weeke following, as I had beene ordered, the B. vvas not vvell in the morning of the Court-day, & in that respect kept his chamber, yet having notice of my attending, sent for me, & lying on his bed reasoned & expostulated with me touching the Ceremonies a full houre, letting fall by the way some complaints, that his remisse course with us, had beene prejudiciall to his preferment to Lincolne Bishoprick, vacant about that time. Soe that in great passion he threatned to suspend, excommunicate, degrade, and make the land too hot for me; asking me what I would doe. I answvered in the words of the Prophet, * I will looke unto the Lord, I will wait for the God of my salvation: my God will heare me. He retorted, God would not heare a blasphemer, a blasphemer of his mother the Church of England, & that despised her ordinances. I answvered againe, that I desired to feare God, & abhorred blasphemy; & that a refusall of conformity to superstitious ceremonies, esteemed by the Prelaticall party to be things indifferent, was neither blasphemy nor contempt. In conclusion he vvas pleased to dismisse me at that time vvithout any censure, save of paying large fees to officers of the Court, tovvards paymēt vvherof he gave ten shillings. Not long after this the said Prelate printed a booke in defense of the 3 nocent Ceremonies, pretending to answver our argumēts given in against them, * & also that unanswverable Abridgment of the reasons of the Ministers of Lincolne Diocesse, so farre as it argued against them. But the vveaknes of his Defense and pretended answver is fully & effectually discovered by the learned D. Ames in his prin-

* Mic. 7. 7.

* *Abridgm. was given to the B by M. Midsley sonne of father Midsley. They both had beene Vicars of Ratsdale in Lancashire, & deprived for inconformity to Ceremonies. The sonne after degradation became a Physitian, & was prosecuted for not kneeling at Sacrament.*

printed Reply therto: And in his Freſh Suit againſt humane Ceremonies in Gods vvorſhip, or Triplication to D. Burgeſſe his Rejoynder for D. Morton.

The tranſlation of the ſaid Prelate to Lichfeild neere the ſame time, became occaſion to D. Bridgman, the Parſon of Wiggan in Lancaſhire, to ſucceed in the Biſhoprick of Cheſter; vvho for a ſpace moved not much againſt any, purſuing rather his vvorldly affaires, ſave only that he ſuſpended a fevv Non-conformiſts, and * Knuteſford Chappel. But vvhen D. Neale the Prelate of Wincheſter, could not reſiſt the title of Grace, but vvas removed to York, & ſhould viſit in Cheſter Dioceſſe, being in that Province; then the ſaid Prelate of Cheſter, pretending feare of the Archb. of Y. in caſe that at his Viſitation he ſhould finde any Non-conformiſts, & ſoe taxe him of negligence or partiality, did therfore ſend for & inhibit privatly moſt of the Non-conformiſts in his Dioceſſe. About the ſame time, upō notice given, I went to him at his houſe in Lancaſhire, & deſired his favorable connivency as formerly; which he denied to grant, leſt (as he ſaid) he ſhould hazard the favour of his Prince. Yet he required to heare at that time what I could ſay againſt kneeling at the Sacrament. I alledged our Saviour Chriſt his argument againſt it. For † he eſteemeth it a vaine worſhipping of him, when mens precepts are taught for doctrines; which by a juſt inference I applyed againſt kneeling at the Sacrament. Now all the anſvver the B. gave was that he expected from me a more learned argument. And then ſaid, He thought I would have inſiſted in the geſture uſed by Chriſt at the inſtitutiō, which he would ſhew me what manner of geſture that was, to convince therby how unſeemly the uſe of it would be in the

* *At Knuteſford a market towne in Cheſhire a Gentleman of the countrey being vainly diſpoſed, did cauſe a beare paſſing through the ſtreet to be led into the Chappell: which the Biſhop hearing of ſuſpended the Chappell from having any divine ſervice or ſermons for a long time, as being profaned by the beare.*

† *Math. 15. 9. Mark. 7. 7.*

Church. And ſo he gravely laid himſelfe along on a bench by a table in his parlour, leaning on his elbow: & then affirmed Chriſts poſture all the Supper was ſuch; which he ſaid, I was not able to contradict, eſpecially if I underſtood Greek, ſith the originall word uſed in the Goſpells, implied ſoe much. I replied, that what ever my underſtanding in the Greek tongue was, yet undoubtedly the Tranſlaters of the new Teſtament were ſkilfull therin, & had rendred it **Sitting*. Yea & D. Morton, his predeceſſor, notwithſtanding he kept a ſtirre about the tranſlatiõ, yet cõfeſſed, it was a kinde of ſitting.

* *Math.* 26. 20. *Mark.* 14. 18. *Luk.* 22. 14. *Iohn.* 13. 12.

About two yeers after (whẽ 'twas thought the ſtorme of the Archb. Viſitation had been blowne over) meanes was uſed againe to the B. of Cheſter to obteine liberty of preaching; but failing, there were procured from Y. 3 writings, ſigned by the Regiſter of the H. Com. in the behalfe of three of us in Cheſhire, giving way to our going on in preaching as formerly. But within three moneths following, attachmẽts were brought from the H. Com. (no letters miſſive having preceded) to apprehend & bring us to York, & there to impriſon us till we ſhould give ſecurity to ſatiſfy the Court, in all their demãds. In this ſtrait (having had ſome notice through the good providence of God, before the attachments could be ſerved, & knowing too much already (a) of the abſurd unreaſonablenes of that Court) we withdrew ourſelves as the (b) Prophet Eliah ſomtime eſcaped the fury of Ahab. Howbeit the inquiry of theſe H. Comiſſi. was not only ſuch, as was after the (c) Prophet in publik intimations in our Pariſhes in Cheſhire, & taking the meſſengers oath he foũd us not, but alſo in ſõe kinde more malicious: for they fined us in great ſumes of money, & agravated our fines one Court-day after another, & then returned them

(a) 2. *Theſ.* 3. 2.

(b) 1. *King.* 17. 5.

(c) *Ibid. ca.* 18. 10.

them into the Exchequer at London, where they were extended for the Kings uſe & then begged by M. Tirill a ſervant to his Maj. with whō we were enforced to compoūd for preſent money paid in hād to our great impoveriſhmēt, as being otherwiſe liable to greater troubles.

I humbly beſeech your Honors to pardon this boldnes thus farre animated by your garcious aimes & endeavours to vindicate the liberties of your diſtreſſed countrymē: Wherin I ſhould ſtill have remained patiently ſilent, both in my owne & brethrēs behalfe, had our ſufferings beene all (although the Hierarchie could not countervaile the damage to our King & nation) & had there not now beene an opportunity of ſome redreſſe. I crave leave therfore to ſuggeſt a few of the wofull fruits * & ſad conſequents of Prelaticall proceedings. For evē hence it is come to paſſe that, 1. Some well affected Parents have beene diſcouraged from training up their hopefull ſonnes in ſuch learning as ſhould fit to the Miniſtery. 11. Some conſcientious yong men, having attained to a good degree of learning, have diverted, & applied their ſtudies otherwaies. 111. Some in the Miniſtery concerning the faith have made ſhipwrack, or ſchiſmed dangerouſly, entertaining unſoūd, & unwarrantable opinions & courſes, turning to be Anabaptiſts, Separatiſts, Semi-ſeparatiſts, &c. and others become licentious, or meerly formall and careles in the execution of their calling. 1v. Some of the (e) people have followved their pernicious & deceivable waies of Anabaptiſme, Separation, Independēcy, Popularity, & Profaneſſe, by reaſon of whom the way of trueth is evill ſpoken of. (f) Like Prieſt, like People. v. But behold greater ſcandals thē theſe; for hence (g) the image of jealouſy, which provoketh to jealouſy, even (h) the Myſtery of iniquity hath beene

(d) *Eſth.* 7. 4.

* *Sad conſequents of Prelacy.*

(e) 2. *Pet.* 2. 2.

(f) *Hoſ.* 4. 9.

(g) *Ezek.* 8. 3.

(h) 2. *Theſ.* 2. 7.

(i) *Ezek.* 8.12,16. beene more bold to lift up the head, & (i) chambers of imagery have beene raiſed at the upper end of Chācels, & Altars placed theron, and worſhip directed towards the Eaſt. VI. Hence * a wide gap hath beene opened to Libertiniſme, in the audacious profanation of the Lords day; groſſe contempt of the faithfull miniſtery; ſcorning at the performances of family duties; bolſtring of ignorance, the ſtepdame of devotiō; countenancing of Wakes, Ruſh-bearings, Mixt-dancings, May-poles, Beare-beatings, Stage-playes, Revellings, Healthings, & all manner of the like diſordered courſes, with a cenſuring all ſtrictnes in religion, & circumſpect walking to be fooliſh preciſenes & Puritaniſme. VII. Hence have followed thoſe irregular confuſions in the popular and independent governmēt of the Browniſtically affected, breaking in pieces againe and againe to their great reproch; & yet diſcovering therby, that their (k) *newv way* is not of God, ſith it doeth daily come to nought, by their owne diſuniting and unchurching of themſelves. VIII. Hence have riſen thoſe great thoughts of heart amongſt brethrē, occaſioning bitter contentions, fruitles janglings, cenſorious words, tart & galling writings, alienation of affections, ſtrangenes of countenance, breach of Chriſtian fellowſhip, interruption of prayers, & neglect of neceſſary mutual offices. IX. Yea & hence doubtles hath iſſued (as from the proper originall) that unworthy Remonſtrance againſt Preſbytery, repreſented to the houſe of Peers from divers Noblemen and Gentlemē of Cheſhire, as appeareth by a printed booke under the name of Sir Thomas Aſton Baronet, 1641. The greivous ſcādal & offence wherof may in ſome part be evinced by theſe ſhort animadverſions following.

* *In the yeere 1617. D. Mortō B. of Cheſter framed the directions for the firſt liberty grūted to ſports on the Lords day; at the ſame time he ſoe eagerly proſecuted the Non-conformiſts about Ceremonies.*

(k) *Act.* 5.38.

(l) *Iudg.* 5.15.

Animadverſions on the Cheſhire Remonſtrance.

I. The title of it; A Remonſtrance againſt Preſbytery.

A-

ANIMADVERS. Of the title the ſame may be ſaid, which was obſerved * by the great & wiſe king Iames of famous memory, touching the title of Bertius his booke *de apoſtaſia ſanctorum*, viz. The title only were enough to make it worthy the fire. Becauſe 1. The holy Scripture approveth of Preſbytery, as a divine ordinãce both for the (m) impoſitiõ of hands, & alſo for (n) the exerciſe of rule & government. 11. Preſbytery is eſtabliſhed in the neighbour Reformed Churches, which are precious in the eyes of the Lord, & of all well-affected to the reformed religiõ in England. 111. Prelaticall men are not wont in their writings to contradict it ſimply. How commeth it then to paſſe that ſome in Cheſhire (o) are not afraid to ſpeake againſt Preſbytery?

* *Declaration againſt Vorſtius.*

(m) 1. *Tim.* 4.14.
(n) 1. *Tim.* 5.17.
(o) *Numb.* 12.8.

II. The pretended occaſion of the Remonſtrance againſt Preſbytery, alledged by the contriver & ſubſcribers, is, A Petition; & Poſitions preached at Cheſter, & Knuteſford, annexed to the Remonſtrance.

ANIMADV. The occaſion of the ſuggeſted pretence, is but a meere pretence, having noe juſt ground at all. For 1. Neither the Petition, nor Poſitions añexed to the Remonſtrance doe ſeeke for *Preſbytery, but ſeeme rather to affect a popular government. 11. The Patrons of popular government (contended for in the poſitions) are for the moſt part either Separatiſts, or Semi-ſeparatiſts, who are as oppoſite to Preſbyteriall governmẽt, as they are to Prelacy; as is well knowne to them that know them. And therfore it behooveth Cheſhire men to (p) give righteous judgement, when they take upon them to cenſure, & in-no-wiſe confound & jumble together opiniõs & defenders of them ſoe directly oppoſite. For (q) we muſt all appeare at the tribunall of the (r) righteous judge of all the world, who will doe right.

* *Preſbyterian diſcipline mentioned in the poſitions in greater characters ſeeme to be the words of Remõſt. not of the Preacher, diſaffected to Preſbyterian government.*

(p) *Iohn.* 7.24.
(q) 2. *Cor.* 5.10.
(r) *Gen.* 18.25.

III

*Provinciall & Diocesan BB. are to be understood by the Remonstr. otherwise nothing is concluded.

III. Remonstr. taketh for granted that *Provinciall & Diocesan Bishops are of Apostolicall institution; (f) alledging in the margent two texts of Scripture for his proofe.

(f) Philip. 1. 1. 1. Tim. 3. 1.

Animadv. Neither of the texts alledged doe inferre an Apostolicall institution of Provinciall & Diocesan Bishops. For, 1. The originall words translated *Bishops or Overseers, & *Presbyters or Elders, are equivalent names of the same office, & are soe used in the (t) Scripture. 11. The pleaders for Hierarchie doe grant that Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture phrase are the same. 111. The text in the Epist. to Phil. 1. 1. mentioneth *Bishops* in the plurall number, that is, such officers as did oversee the Church at Philippi, & not a Bishop alone, superiour to other officers in degree, or government, according to the opinio of Hierarchicall men (v) affecting preeminence. 1v. The text in 1. Tim. 3. 1. mentioneth also office, as well as Bishop, which office is described in the (x) subsequent verses to be the office of the Presbyter. And this may appeare further by comparing therwith the (y) Epist. to Titus. v. It is good to be wise according to sobriety in understanding some things in (z) Pauls Epistles & other Scriptures, lest for wāt of learning & stability they be wrested to destruction. This is an usefull item for Cheshire men & others also.

* ἐπίσκοπος.
* πρεσβύτερος.
(t) Act. 20. 17, 28. 1. Pet. 5. 1, 2.
(v) 3. John. 9.
(x) 1. Tim. 3. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.
(y) Tit. 1. 5, 6, 7.
(z) 2. Pet. 3. 16.

IV. Remonstr. commendeth Bishops, that they were the great lights of the Churches; and Martyrs in primitive times.

Animadv. There is noe consequence to justify Prelacy hence. For 1. Papists pretend the same thing, albeit unjustly, in the behalfe of their Romish Bishops & Hierarchie. 11. The name of Bishops or Presbyters is oftentimes indifferently by the Fathers attributed to

those

thoſe great lights, and Martyrs: as is evident in their books, & ſufficiently cleered by Orthodox Writers againſt the Papiſts. III. Such Biſhops as had a ſuperiority in thoſe times, * received it from the Church in humane policy, not by divine inſtitution.

* *Ierom. Comment. on Epiſt. to Titus.*

V. REMONST. aſcribeth to Prelates the redemption of the purity of the Goſpell now profeſſed in England from Romiſh corruption.

ANIMADVERS. This aſſertion ſeemeth to want the trueth of ſtory. For I. In the booke of Martyrs alledged by the Remonſtr. the reformation of religion is referred to King Edward himſelfe, & his Counſell, & Parliamēt. II. King Edward approved himſelfe better then the beſt of the Prelates, in withſtanding toleration of Maſſe to his ſiſter, at the requeſt of the Emperour. III. Archb. Cranmer acknowledged to M. Cheke that King Edward had more Divinity in his litle finger, then all they had in all their bodies. Let the Remonſt. therfore henceforth take heed of detracting from Kings unjuſtly, to extoll the Biſhops unjuſtly.

* *Act. mon. 9. book. Edw. 6. begin.*

VI. REMONST. obſerveth that divers of the Prelates have beene great aſſertors of our religion againſt the common enemies of Rome.

ANIMADV. I. Divers of the Prelates have beene too great friends to Rome, as it is famouſly knowne, both heretofore, & of late alſo. II. The Prelates generally have more vehemently proſecuted the faithfull Miniſters refuſing conformity to ſome popiſh ceremonies, (albeit of the ſame religion profeſſed and eſtabliſhed in England) thē the ſuperſtitious & idolatrous Papiſts, the grand enemies of the reformed religion. II. The Prelates generally doe make uſe of divers arguments uſed by Romaniſts againſt Proteſtants for their Hierarchicall

discipline & Ceremonies. IV. The greateſt aſſertors of the reformed religion amongſt the Prelates make uſe againſt the Papiſts of the Non-conformiſts arguments againſt prelacy & ſuperſtition. V. Non-conformiſts & Miniſters of the Reformed Churches, where Preſbytery is eſtabliſhed, have approved themſelves oppugners of Antichriſt to purpoſe.

VII. REMONST. urgeth a continuance of Prelacy, ſith it is eſtabliſhed by the laws of the land.

(a) 1. King. 12. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33. (b) 1. King. 16. 26. Mic. 6. 16.

ANIMADV. I. It ſomtimes falleth out that[a] unjuſt laws are enacted, & [b] continued in a land profeſſing religiō, touching both the Miniſtery & Ceremonies. II. Parliaments doe aſwell ſerve to repeale, as to enact laws, as juſt cauſe & occaſion ſhall require. And accordingly Engliſh Parliaments have beene wont to proceed.

VIII. REMONST. affirmeth that in the doctrine of the Prelates generally taught nothing is found diſſonant from Gods word.

ANIMADV. I. The Prelates generally have taught very ſeldome, ſoe that it cannot much be taken notice what māner of doctrine they teach. Queene Eliz. is reported to ſay, that when ſhe made a Biſhop, ſhe marred a Preacher. II. [c] Deceitfull workers doe ſomtimes tranſforme themſelves into the Apoſtles of Chriſt. III. It is well knowne that many of thē, & their favorites have beene deeply ſtained with Popiſh, & Arminian points. IV. The Prelates generally have countenanced Arminians rather then any way oppoſed them.

(c) 2. Cor. 11. 13.

IX. REMONSTR. ſuggeſteth a danger of tenents preached publickly, & of printed pamphlets, &c.

* See above 2. Animadv.

ANIMADV. I. Such * ſuggeſtion againſt tenents intimated, doth not at all reflect on the ſeekers of Preſbyterial government. II. Albeit 'twere to have beene deſired, that noe

noe ſuch unwarrantable courſes had beene held by preposterous and popular zealots, yet it is noe new thing that (d) Satã by his inſtruments ſhould ſow tares in Gods wheat field. iii. Anabaptiſts in Luthers time were a great ſcandall to the begun glorious reformation, yet not any juſt ground of prejudice againſt it. (d) *Math.* 13.39.

X. Remonstr. conceiteth that the 26 Prelates are eaſily reſponſall to Parliaments, for any of their deviations from the rule of law.

Animadv. i. Deviation that is (e) wholly devious is not at all reſponſall either to God or rationall men. Such a deviation is Prelacy, conſidered as Prelacy, in the ſenſe of the * rigid patrons of it. ii. Prelates have not beene eaſily reſponſall to Parliaments at any time for their deviations in prelacy, till this preſent Parliament. iii. There are more then 26 Ordinaries that diſpenſe the Civill & Canon law, viz. Suffraganes, Chancellors, Cõmiſſaries, Arch-deacons, Officials, Surrogates, Rurall deanes, Subdeanes, &c. iv. It is better to (f) roote up the plants, which God hath not planted. (e) 2. *King.* 23.15. * *D. Bilſon, D. Downham, D. Hall.* (f) *Math.* 15.13.

XI. Remonst. feareth future inconvenience may be found in the government of a numerous Preſbytery in England, which may conſiſt of neere 40000 Church-governors.

Animadv. i. No inconveniẽce need be feared in eſtabliſhing of Chriſts ordinance. ii. The errors of Preſbyteries in their government are reſponſall to Claſſes & Synods. iii. It was the honor of the land (g) of Iſrael in King Davids reigne, that there were numbred from the age of 30 yeers & upward 38000 Church-officers. And would it not be the honor of England in the reigne of King Charles to have 40000 Elders to overſee the Lords houſes in the daies of the Goſpell? iv. It is much to be (g) 1. *Chro.* 23.3, 4, 5.

feared (such have beene the unhappy fruits of Prelacy) that they that should be chosen to oversee in Parishes, wilbe (h) found too few, soe that there wilbe great need of uniting or combining severall lesser Parishes adjoyning into one Presbytery.

(h) 2. Chro. 29. 34.

XII. Remonstr. apprehendeth that presbyterian government may prove to be inconsistent with Monarchie, and dangerously conducible to Anarchie.

Animadv. I. Monarchie in the civill state and Presbytery being both Gods ordinances are not inconsistent one with another. There may be a (i) rendring to Cæsar, the things that are Cæsars, and to God, the things that are Gods, in one and the same Commonwealth. II. King * Iames of b. m. knew and found a consistency of Monarchie and Presbytery together in Scotland. III. King Charles findeth the same in Scotland at this day. IV. The Vnited Netherlands doe finde by experience that Presbytery is noe way conducible to Anarchie. But had the reines of Presbytery beene loosed, as the Arminians affected, what might have ensued may easily be guessed by some begun commotions of that party.

(i) Matth. 22. 21.

* Basil. dor. Epist. to reader.

XIII. Remonstr. feareth that the consequents of Presbytery would be the utter losse of learning & lawes.

Animadv. I. There (k) are some that oft feare, where noe feare is. II. Learning and lawes doe flourish gloriously in the reformed Churches, where Presbytery is established. III. Prejudice and losse of learning and lawes have in great part beene occasioned by Prelacy. For 1. Is it not through the default of Prelates, that there are soe many (l) unlearned & unable to preach in the ministery? 2. Is it not by the negligence of Prelates, that there are soe many negligent Ministers, suffe-

(k) Psal. 53. 5.

(l) Isa. 56. 10. 11.

ſuffering their gifts to decay by ſeldome preaching?
3. Is it not from their qualifications and diſpenſations, there are ſoe many Nonreſidents, & Pluraliſts, as that other Schollers of better deſert do want encouragmēt?
4. Doeth not the Parliament well enough know & underſtand who are the Seekers of the ſubverſion of the lawes, and of introducing an arbitrary government?

XIV. REMONS. is ſubſcribed by a numerous ſort of the Nobles, Baronets, Knights, Eſquires, Divines, Gentlemen, Freeholders, & others inhabitants of Cheſhire.

ANIMADV. This is indeed the ſad conſequent of Prelacy in Cheſhire. Ah & alas, that * Cheſhire not long agone reputed & deſervedly eſteemed for the (m) profeſſion & power of religion more excellent then their neighbors, ſhould (n) now turne to a degenerate plant of a ſtrange vine to the Lord! Eſpecially the Miniſtery that had their ſpiritually glorious * monethly Exerciſes, & ſolemne aſſemblies (beſides their bleſſed Sabbaths) frequented by ſundry of the renowned Gentry; & very many wel-diſpoſed people, wherby (o) they purchaſed to themſelves a good degree in Chriſtianity & great boldnes in the faith, which is in Chriſt Ieſus. But yet it may be thought in a charitable conſtruction, ſome excuſe of the greatnes of their error, that either the moſt of thē ſubſcribed the Remonſtrance (p) in their ſimplicity, not knowing wherto it tended, or els in an inconſiderate haſt, being * urged to doe quickly, what they did, ſith diſpatch was the life of the buſines, & noe copies permitted to be taken. However, its not to be doubted, but that (q) He that walketh amidſt the golden candleſticks, (r) doeth graciouſly take knowledge of many names in Cheſhire ((ſ) it may be 7000) that as (t) Iuda doe yet rule with God, and are faithfull with the Saints.

* *Cheſhire the cheife ſhire.*
(m) *Prov.* 12. 26.
(n) *Ier.* 2. 21.
* *Exerciſes at Northwich, Namptwich, Knutesford, Maccleſfeild, Bowden, Frodſham, Budworth, Torperley, Tarvin, Ince, Motterum, &c.*
(o) 1. *Tim.* 3. 13.
(p) 2. *Sam.* 15. 11.
* *The letters ſent to the ſeverall Hundreds required a haſty diſpatch.*
(q) *Reve.* 2. 1.
(r) *Reve.* 3. 4.
(ſ) 1. *King.* 19. 18.
(t) *Hoſ.* 11. 12.

Right honorable, there is no feare of your abundant wisdomes in discerning of these greivous Prelaticall maladies, nor of your compassionate faithfulnes in applying seasõable remedies; sith all mẽ must needs acknowledge, that its (v) a true report, they have heard of your acts & wisdome, exceeding the fame thereof. (x) Blessed be the Lord God of England that hath visited and redeemed his people. (y) Let the Churches of the Saints in England, Scotland, & Ireland, now say, his mercy endureth for ever. Let the Non-conformists ((z) Gods hidden ones in those lands) now say, his mercy endureth for ever. Yee (a) mighty men of valour, the Lord hath beene with you hitherto, (b) subduing the Lyon & the Beare (even the High Commission court, & Starre chamber) that did prey upon the flock. Goe on in this your might to save from (that uncircumcised Philistin) the oppressing Hierarchie. And let it be (c) noe offence of heart to your Honors to (d) be stirred up to goe forward, making the word of God the (e) man of your counsell. And for your better helpe and (f) guidance, may it please your Honors to make use of the labors of godly-learned Interpreters, that have beene the excellent lights of the Reformed Churches, both * abroad & also in *England; observing withall the Apostolicall advertisment touching (g) the Custome of the Churches of Christ, and their (h) comly order, even of the purest* reformed Churches from all Antichristianisme, both in doctrine & discipline. These Reformed Churches have in their citties, townes, and villages (i) Presbyteries; (k) consisting of teaching & ruling Elders, chosen by the plurality of their voices, consented unto by the Congregation, & approved by the Magistrates and Classis. These (l) Elders doe take heed to the flock, over which the

(v) 1. *King.* 10.6.7.
(x) *Luk.* 1.68.
(y) *Psal.* 118.2.
(z) *Psal.* 83.3.
(a) *Iudg.* 6.12.14.
(b) 1. *Sam.* 17.36.
(c) 1. *Sam.* 25.31.
(d) 2. *Pet.* 1.12.
(e) *Psal.* 119.24.
(f) *Act.* 8.31.

* *Calvin, Beza, G. Bucer, Didoclavius, &c.*
* *Cartwright, Traverse, Vdal, Parker, Bayne, &c.*
(g) 1. *Cor.* 11.16.
(h) *Colos.* 2.5.
* *Scots, French, Dutch, &c.*
(i) 1. *Tim.* 4.14.
(k) 1. *Tim.* 5.17.
(l) *Act.* 20.17.28.

the Holy Ghoſt hath made them Overſeers; They ordaine Officers, admit to the Sacraments, admoniſh and cenſure offenders, according to (m) Chriſts rule of diſcipline: and they ſignify to the Congregation what belongeth to thē to take knowledge of, either to conſent unto the ſame, or except againſt it, as juſt cauſe ſhall require. And in caſe ſome difficulty doe appeare in the affaires of the Church, that cannot be decided well by the Preſbytery, thē they have a liberty (& are wont) to appeale (n) & ſeeke helpe & aſſiſtance from the Claſſis, conſiſting of neighbour Preſbyteries, (called by ſome alſo Preſbyteries) with which they are combined in an equall power & authority, noe One exerciſing any prelaticall preeminence. And if the matter controverted cannot ſatiſfactorily be determined by the Claſſis, thē there is a referēce to the Provinciall Synod, conſiſting of the Deputies choſē by the ſeverall Claſſes, of equall power & authority. And if yet agreement be not made, then the matter is to be brought to a Nationall Synod, cōſiſting of Deputies ſent frō the Provinciall Synods. In their ſeverall Preſbyteries, Claſſes, & Synods, Provinciall & Nationall, they have Preſidents and Scribes choſen from amongſt themſelves for the more orderly menaging of their Seſſions. And in Synods ſome cheife Magiſtrats are preſent to ſee order obſerved. This way of Chriſt, walked in by the Reformed Churches, is the way of peace, liberty, & edificatiō, though carped at by ſome (o) that ſpeake evill of what they neither know nor underſtand. And for the more cleere & pregnant demonſtratiō hereof, the following treatiſe touching the power of Elderſhips, Claſſes, & Synods may be of ſingular uſe; written by an (p) able, judicious, & pious Divine, inſtructed to the Kingdome of heaven, having beene

(m) *Math.* 18. 17.

(n) *Act.* 15. 2.

(o) *Iude verſ.* 8. 16.

(p) *Math.* 13. 52.

beene well ſtudied, and diligently exerciſed in the doctrine & practiſe of diſcipline above 30 yeeres together; whilſt he was Paſtor of the Engliſh reformed Church in Amſterdam; where was ſpeciall occaſion (q) to put forth his talent, by reaſon of the cheifeſt of the Separatiſts that ſojourned there at the ſame time. And albeit the Author lived not to finiſh, & review his paines, yet through divine providence, a Timothy (r) who knew his waies (trained up in the Scriptures, & other good learning in Schooles, and Vniverſity, and for preſent (ſ) a workman that needeth not to be aſhamed) hath brought the (t) parchments he left behinde him to publick uſe, for the common benefit of the Engliſh nation in a time of need, calling for helpe (v) & counſel to defeate the dangerous projects of all Achitophels.

(q) *Matth.* 25. 20.
(r) 1. *Cor.* 4. 17.
(ſ) 2. *Tim.* 2. 15.
(t) 2. *Tim.* 4. 13.
(v) 2. *Sam.* 15. 34.

Right honorable, ye are as (x) Angels of God to diſcerne good & bad, & to ſpeake comfortable words to your afflicted & baniſhed Countreymen; Yee are the great Counſellers, Iudges, and State-phyſitians of England. Now (y) the Wonderfull, Counſeller, the mighty God, the everlaſting Father, the Prince of peace furniſh your Honors more & more with the (z) Spirit of wiſdome & underſtanding, the Spirit of Counſell and might, the Spirit of knowledge & of the feare of the Lord, (a) & fulfill all your counſells which are for the (b) glory of God, for the (c) honor of our gracious King Charles, and for the true (d) welfare of England, Scotland, & Ireland; even ſoe prayeth

(x) 2. *Sam.* 14. 17.
(y) *Iſa.* 9. 6.
(z) *Iſa.* 11. 2.
(a) *Pſal.* 20. 4.
(b) 1. *Cor.* 10. 31.
(c) 1. *Pet.* 2. 17.
(d) *Iob*, 22. 30.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Your Honors moſt humble advertiſer, and devoted obſerver,

THOMAS PAGET.

The

THere are two ſtaves wherewith the Lord Chriſt, the great Shepherd of his ſheep, doth uſually feed his flock; Doctrine and Diſcipline. By the one he maketh them to lie downe in greene paſtures, and leadeth them beſide the ſtill waters, repleniſhing their ſoules with the food of life; by the other he guideth them and ordereth them in their going out and comming in, for their further peace and ſafety: and both his rodde and his ſtaffe doe comfort them. If either of theſe be wanting, the flock is endangered; & if God in his juſt judgement cauſe one of them to faile, the other preſently comes to be in jeopardy. Wofull experience hath taught, that where the reignes of Diſcipline are ſlackned or ill guided, there the ſoundnes of Doctrine doth hardly ſubſiſt long: and where the trueth of Doctrine is aſſaulted, there the courſe of Diſcipline is not free from injurious attempts. Though Doctrine juſtly challenge the firſt place, yet ſeeing Diſcipline alſo, to ſpeak properly, is a part of Doctrine, being onely the practiſe of divine trueth revealed concerning the guidance of the Church; hence it may not without cauſe ſhare in the arguments alledged for the neceſſity and benefit of the other. They both being ſo neerly allyed, and joyntly requiſite to the welfare of Gods Church, the Enemy, ever envying the proſperity, and plotting the ruine thereof, where he cannot prevayle againſt the one, he ſets on work his miſchievous devices againſt the other: When he cannot hinder the growth of good corne and ſound trueths, by ſowing tares; then he makes ſo much the more furious onſets upon the fences and hedges of due order and government. And if his deſignes may be effected in the one, he findes a readyer way to the other. But he that hath bruiſed Satans head, is not ignorant of his devices, nor ſlow to reſiſt him in his enterpriſes. Chriſt doth graciouſly provide for the ſafety of his flock, againſt both kindes of evills, by ſuch inſtruments as he is wont to rayſe for the explaining and vindicating the trueth of thoſe lawes which he hath given, both to direct and maintaine his people in the obedience of his will, and to ſtop the mouth of all iniquity oppugning the ſame. His goodnes therefore is to be acknowledged in whatſoever helps to this purpoſe are affoorded unto us. And that thou mayeſt the better be provoked hereunto, Chriſtian Reader, concerning the Treatiſe now preſented unto thee, take a brief ſurvey at thy firſt entrance, of ſomewhat may further fit thee unto a more judicious and profitable peruſall of the work itſelf.

The maine errours touching the exerciſe of Church-government, may be reduced unto theſe two extremes, whereby men ſwarve from that middle and ſafe way preſcribed by Chriſt, the onely Prince and Lawgiver of his Church. Some ambitious of preeminence, making themſelves lords over Gods heritage, have brought in, and ſeek to maintaine a Tyrannicall kinde of government in the Church, by ingroſſing all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction into their owne hands, as the Popes, and Popiſh Biſhops: Againſt theſe Vſurpers many Worthies have ſtood up, and done valiantly, in their Writings, whereof divers remaine yet unanſwered. Others have erroneouſly fallen into a contrary extreme; while oppoſing Hierarchicall Tyranny, they have become pleaders for a meere Democracy; and not contēt to reject Provinciall & Dioceſan Biſhops, they have impugned the lawfull

com-

combination of Churches in Provinciall and Classicall Synods. Against this twofold errour the ensuing Treatise is directed. The former part thereof was written long agone, about the yeare 1618. upon the occasion noted in the Introduction. And though it was but a beginning of a larger writing, neither finished nor polished for publick view: yet considering how little there is extant in this kinde, how usefull it may be for these times, and what affinity it hath with the other controversy touching Classes and Synods, by how much the opposers of such joynt Presbyteries doe seldome allow the due power of particular Elderships; I thought good to prefixe it before the other, in such wise as it doth now come foorth. The second and maine part of this Treatise discusseth at large (and more fully then any other yet seene) the question concerning the due power of Classicall & Synodall Assemblies. A controversy, in a manner unknowne to former ages, and for the present scarcely heard of among the Reformed Churches in other nations. For though the positive trueth thereof be manifest from the testimonies of Orthodox Writers of all times and places; yet hitherto it hath not beene shewed that ever any Authours of note (I meane either of former ages, or other nations) have maintained the assertions here opposed, viz. that the power of Classes & Synods is an undue power, and that all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction must be confined within the bounds of a particular Congregation. *H. Barrow*, & those of that Sect, are noted to be the first that in such sort have opposed this kinde of government. The *Arminians* indeed have spoken much against the jurisdiction & deciding sentence of Synods, * but upon other grounds; to wit, so farre as it taketh away that liberty of Prophecy which they plead for, and describe to be in effect an unlimited licentiousnes of venting and maintaining almost any thing in matters of religion. They doe so contradict the power of Synods, that withall they overthrow all Ecclesiasticall judgment and censure (at least in matters of heresie & false doctrine) as well in a particular Congregation as elswhere. Herein they differ from the Patrons of Independencie, here disputed against. These therefore, though they be not all Brownists, yet they must not take it ill to see this errour in the following Treatise sometimes branded with the mark of *Brownisme*, especially when the Authour deales with Mr *Canne*, a knowne Separatist, and hitherto the busiest Disputer for this opinion. Besides, it is not unknowne that this Tenet of Independency hath been attended with Semiseparatisme in divers of the better sort of those that have held it, both in Mr *Iacobs* time, when Orthodox men began first to be stained with it; & of later yeares also, when new exorbitant oppressions of the Hierarchy, have occasioned many to witnesse their dislike of Prelaticall government, whereof some eschewing that rock of usurping Episcopacy, have inconsiderately rushed upon these sands of Popularity and Independency. And these are the points here discussed.

* Censur. Confes. Remonstr. p. 322, 326, 328. Apol. Remonstr. f. 6. & 282--290.

Concerning the Authour of this Defence, not to speak of his other abilities wherewith he was excellently furnished unto every good work in the Ministery whereunto he was called, it may be observed how he was specially fitted unto the maintaining of trueths of this nature. He was not as one of yesterday in regard of his knowledge, study & practise of these points of Church-government. Long experience hath taught him in these things what he sayth, and whereof he affir-

meth.

meth. Of thoſe fourty yeares & upward, wherein he laboured in the Miniſtery, for thirty of them & above, he hath beene converſant in the exerciſe of Preſbyteriall and Claſſicall government. During which time, his abode being in the ſame place where the ancient and chiefeſt oppoſites unto this Diſcipline were ſeated, he had ſpeciall occaſion to be acquainted with their courſes, and to arme himſelf and others againſt them. Beſides, it may not be amiſſe to obſerve the correſpondence which the Authour hath had with divers of the learnedeſt of our nation, together with the eſteeme which they have had of him and his abilities in theſe points of Divine learning. I will inſtance onely in theſe three Worthies, *Mr Parker*, *Mr Sh.* the Author of the *Reply to D. Down*, and *D. Ames*; whoſe names uſe frequently to be mentioned in writings of this kinde. For *Mr Parker*, the familiar and loving acquaintance betwixt him and the Authour, is partly noted * in the Treatiſe itſelf. And though *Mr Dav.* would make his Reader to ſuſpect it were otherwiſe, yet if what he hath written * to this purpoſe be examined by the rule and ſquare of trueth; it will be found to be onely a ſiniſter inſinuation, grounded upon unſound reports. The widow of *Mr Par.* hath of later yeares before ſufficient witneſſes proteſted ſolemnely the foule untrueth of that that was layd to this our Authours charge concerning him. Which charge while Mr D. undertakes to juſtify, he ſleightly paſſeth over the maine thing wherewith the *Anſwerer*, as he calles him, had cleered himſelf from that imputation, and inſtead of due anſwer, turneth aſide unto other matters, neither true nor pertinent, as may be manifeſted from undenyable evidences. After *Mr Parker* removed to *Doeſborough*, to preach to that *Gariſon* (not to a *Leager*, as Mr D. hath it;) where he died, not about 3 moneths (as Mr D. ſaith) but above 8 moneths at leaſt after he went from *Amſterdam*; not in the yeare 1613. (as Mr D. was informed) but in the y. 1614: from thence he wrote many loving letters to the Authour, wherein he doth thankfully acknowledge ſundry kinde offices received, & occaſionally intreateth the performance of others. Among the reſt, being cauſeleſly accuſed touching ſome things in his booke *de Deſcenſu ad Inferos* (which he dedicated to our Authour, together with the other Officers of the ſame Church) he writes thus, *I pray, uſe the meanes which conveniently you can, to cleere my innocency, &c.* And afterwards in another letter; *I thanke you for your paines in defending my innocency, which I would keep if I might, howſoever the ſucceſſe fall out for my returne to Amſterdam, &c.* Touching that very matter he writes, *I thanke you for the paines you have taken for me, although in vaine: at which I am not diſmayed nor any whit moved, being aſſured that it is come to paſſe by the will of the Lord, who I know will be my God as well out of Amſterdam as in it, &c.* Whereas the ſecond part of Mr Sh. his *Reply* was committed to the Authours truſt, for the overſeeing of the preſſe, and ſome paſſages were obſerved, which he conceived to be prejudiciall unto the due maintaining of the cauſe, *Mr Parker* being advertiſed thereof, returned this anſwer: *I have gone in my * third booke, to the very poynt you doubt of, and there left, till I had ſeen this booke printed. I am not as yet reſolved fully about theſe things: &c. Being I am not as yet clearely reſolved, you may not look I ſhould ſend you my judgement therein, ſave onely this, that I encline to your opinion, for ought I yet ſee in the ſpecialities by you mentioned, &c.* Afterwards, having conſidered further of thoſe particulars, he approved our Authors judgment,

* Pag. 105.

* Apol. reply. p. 74, 75, 76.

* De Polit. Eccleſ.

and ſaith in his next letter, *I verily think as you write, that every Congregation, &c.* The matter itſelf would be too long to rehearſe in this place. He adviſed him at the ſame time to qualify the words about which the difficulty was, &c. who choſe rather to ſend the Copie to Mr P. for the amending or altering of what they conceived to be amiſſe. Mr P. returned the Copie, with theſe words; *I have corrected (as I might) the maine poynt of your ſcruple. As for the reſt, although ſome things might be bettered, or better ſet downe, or altered, yet (for ought I ſee) they are not ſuch as ſhould ſtay the printing, till Mr A. &c.* The liberty thus uſed about this book was granted by Mr Sh. himſelf, who aſcribed ſo much unto our Authours judgement in theſe matters, that when he ſent the ſayd book to be printed, he wrote thus unto him; *I pray you, peruſe and ponder it, adde, alter, or detract ad placitum. The author is no ſuch man, but can eaſily caſt himſelf downe at, yea under the feet of the Prophets, &c. and the more you doe therein, the more he ſhalbe and will acknowledge himſelf indebted to you, &c.* In his next letter he ſaith, *I heartily intreat you to help more then ordinary, in correcting, not the faults of the workman with you, onely, but my faults alſo. Adde therefore, I pray, alter & detract therein, &c. what the Lord ſhall direct you, &c.* Shortly after he wrote againe to the ſame purpoſe; *Once againe I intreat you to peruſe all well, & adde, alter, or detract what you ſee good.* Our Authour having noted ſomewhat in the *Reply*, as was ſayd before, which he judged to tend to the weakning of the authority of Synods, & to the ſtrengthening of *Mr Iacob* in his oppoſition againſt them, *Mr Sh.* having notice thereof, anſwered as followeth, writing of himſelf in the third perſon, as ſometimes before, for better ſecurity in thoſe dangerous times: *Concerning the difference betwixt the authors judgement and yours, I hope it will not be great, upon ſecond thoughts adviſed. I am ſure his meaning is not to confirme H. Ia. againſt whom he diſputed by writing, about the ſubject you ſpeake of. The author reſteth fully perſwaded of that he hath written, yet referreth againe (as he did before) his doings to cenſure, and that by you, Mr Ames, and Mr Parker, or either of you, to alter, &c. ſoe be that the adverſarie be anſwered.* Afterwards he explained himſelf more fully, on this manner. *Had my beloved altered what he deemed untrue or inſufficient, he had done but what I deſired, and would have bene well pleaſed with, ſoe be that it had not weakned the anſwer. But to come to the particulars. 1. Concerning the Synods, both their inſtitution and power, what it is, belongeth to another queſtion. neither conceive I how ought from that aſſertion in the Reply (which you except againſt) can be draune to prejudice the judgment or practiſe of the Churches governed by Synods: for I conceive not ſo of their Synods, that they robbe the particular Churches (whereof Elders there ſit to determine of cauſes) of the power of government by their Preſbyteries. Nay rather, ſeeing their Synods have their power, by and from the deputation which the Elders there aſſembled have from the particular Churches (if I be not deceyved) it will follow that the power of government originally reſteth in them, and not in the Synods, &c.* Obſerve in theſe paſſages of Mr Sh. 's letters, beſides what I intended and mentioned before. 1. His judgment (ſet downe here more plainly then in any place of his book) touching the power of Synods in the determining of cauſes, agreeable unto that which the Authour maintaineth in this Treatiſe; conſidering what he ſaith in his (a) anſwer to the objections alledged out of *Mr Parker*. 2. The difference then acknowledged betwixt *Mr Iacob* and other Non-conformiſts, concerning the authority of Synods, which Mr D. would

(a) Pag. 89. 90. 203.

ſeeme

seeme to excuse (b) by some words of Mr I. wherein he speakes not directly touching this poynt in controversy. 3. The Authours care to maintaine the due power of Classes and Synods, even in those times, when there could be no suspicion of his owne advantage, or private ingagement therein, wherewith his Opposites doe unjustly (c) upbraid him, faining it to be the cause of his late pleading for them. Moreover, whereas the Authour hath taken the liberty upon occasion, to witnesse his dissent from D. *Ames*, touching certaine particulars in this controversy; he hath done no more then D. A. was wont to allow unto all ingenuous Readers of his writings, and in speciall unto the Authour. When he put forth his first Dispute against *Grevinchovius*, which he inscribed unto our Authour in his (d) Epistles printed with it, where he calles him a *most loving*, *most learned*, and *most judicious man*, he wrote unto him withall in his private letter; *As I leave it to you, to print mine, or not to print, so also to blotte out, or alter, what you see amisse*. To like purpose he wrote unto him concerning his *Reply to D. Morton*. When his booke, called the *Marrow of Divinity*, first came forth, he sent him a Copie, with this expresse condition, that he should write unto him his animadversions upon it. And in like manner, on the other side, when the Author was to publish his *Arrow against the Separation of the Brownists*, he sent the severall parcels first to D. *Ames*, to be perused by him, who answered sometime on this wise: *For this part of your writing unto Mr Ainsw. I finde nothing in it but good*. Of another part he saith: *In it I finde much good paines, and as usefull as the subject would permit; no defect of any moment, &c.* And againe: *I have perused all the rest of the sheets, and finde nothing which I can mend, &c. Your paines have been very great in this businesse: I pray God the fruit may answer thereunto*. Such was the judgement of these godly learned and famous men, touching the Authour, and his sufficiencie for businesses of this kinde. I have set downe nothing here but what *I have to shew in black and white*, as the Author of the Preface to D. *Ames* his last booke (e) saith upon somewhat the like occasion.

(b) Apol. repl. p. 236.

(c) Apol. repl. p. 61, 63, 232, 235. Chur. pl. p. 11. 41. 100.

(d) De Armin. sentēt. Discept. scholast. An. 1613. Præf. ad I. P. Ex memet ipso judicium faciens, tibi (vir amicissime) ficut affirmāti facile credo, sic ut postulanti nunc tandē ceciam, non ægre quidē adducor. &c. Ibi l. p. 57. Viro doctissimo, D. P. Hoc quidem recte judicas, judiciosissime vir, &c.

To come neerer unto the work in hand; the occasion of this writing touching Classes and Synods, cannot but be accounted grievous unto such as have hearts to be affected with the dissensions of brethren. But bitter roots doe many times yeeld sweet and wholesome fruits. God hath here also many wayes ordered for good that which in itself was and tended to evill. I need not inlarge about that whereof they that are desirous, may easily be informed from what hath been heretofore published. In a word, *Complaints* were made by those whom it least beseemed. These being divulged, first in written copies, and afterwards in print, gave just occasion unto as publick an *Answer*. Unto this Answer hath been returned a twofold *Reply*, the one called *Apologeticall*, by him that had holpen to complaine; the other entitled *The Churches plea for her right*, by a knowne Schismatick, standing in opposition to all the Reformed Churches; and in his behalfe, who refused to joyne as a member unto his Church, when he schismed from that whereof he was a member when the complaints were framed. These Replyes undertake to handle, besides matters of fact, these two poynts, that were at the same time opposed, to wit, the due power of Classes and Synods, and the lawfulnes of baptising infants, whose parents are no members of a particular Congre-

(e) Fresh suit, præf. p. G 1. b.

gation. The former of these is sufficiently maintained in the ensuing Treatise. For the other, though the Author have not gone so farre in it as in this; yet he hath layd such a foundation, as upon which it will not be difficult to build what may satisfy for the clearing of that controversie. Whereof more hereafter, as conveniency and publick benefit shall require. Touching personall concernments, though I acknowledge my self doubly and trebly bound to vindicate the Authors reputation, at whose feet I have been brought up, and from whom I have received farre more then by such or better meanes I am ever able to requite; and though it were easy to shew how his opposites have offended in many untrueths touching matters of fact, and vaine pretences of meeknes in the midst of great bitternes, &c. yet I am resolved to passe by, and to bury these things in silence, unlesse further cause be given for the publishing of them. And hereunto as I have been advised by others, so I have the rather yeelded, considering (as they also alledged) that the benefit to be expected from dealing in these matters, would be but of a narrow extent, reaching onely to the satisfaction of a few, and little concerning the maine cause; that the Authours good name and blessed remembrance is so deeply ingraven in the hearts of those that are acquainted with his wayes and writings, that no envie nor obloquie shall ever be able to raze it out. Againe, they that will but compare the *Answer* and *Replyes* together, and distinguish betwixt plaine dealing and groundlesse surmises, evidence of trueth and uncharitable insinuations, shall hardly need any further help for their satisfaction; specially if they be mindfull of the Rule, 1. *Tim.* 5. 19. from which these opposites have too too frequently swarved; and in which respect M^r D. had just cause to intreat his Reader (f) *to suspend his censure concerning what he hath said, &c.* Moreover, that plausible and colourable name of the *Church*, used by the Replyers when they spake of a few dissenting from the Authour, is now further manifested to be inconsistent with those passages whereunto in such sort it was applyed; forasmuch as they that then complained, doe now quietly enjoy themselves and communion with the Church, in the continued observation of the same orders that were practised before: except onely W. B. the foreman of the Complaynants, now a professed Arminian. And of those that once joyned with him, some before, others since the Authours death have plainly signifyed their better respects unto him, and given free and full testimony of his well deservings, even of that Church, both for Doctrine and Discipline.

(f) Apol. repl. præf. neer the end.

To returne unto his Defence, here published, the greater part of it is in way of answer to M^r C. who hath been the forwardest and largest in this part of the plea touching Classes and Synods. It seemes also that he hath not been a little confident of his paines about this work, by the reiterated editions and sundry shapes into which this his writing touching Independent government hath been cast. The (g) first edition, which the Authour here deales with, was seconded with another, into which he hath taken onely that which concernes this controversie, adorning it with this new and faire title, (h) *Syons Prerogative Royall*. And this hath been answered (i) by the famous and truely excellent Divine of these countries, *D. Voetius*. A third edition, it seemes, hath been put forth with some additions against the Presbyteries of particular Churches, under another title, viz.

(g) Printed in the yeare 1635.
(h) In the y. 1641.
(i) Disput. Theol. de Unione Ecclesiarum, earumque Regimine in Classibus & Synodis, par. post. Ultraj. 1641.

The

The Presbyteriall Government examined. And this also hath been examined and answered by the Authour of the (k) *Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, &c. in the Postscript*, thereunto annexed. Thus the same writing hath met with severall Refutations, whereof though this be the last in birth, yet it was the first in conception. And here the Authour, as he tooke more time, so he hath more closely followed his opposite; & being better acquainted with his condition and courses, hath more neerly applyed his answers unto him, for further conviction. However, * it may be profitable to behold severall learned men, avouching and pleading for the same trueth: and many blowes may beat downe an errour, that could not be felld at once. But it may seeme strange that *Mr Cannes* writings, being such as the severall Refuters have observed them to be, should yet have the honour of three severall Refutations. Who ever saw such grosse Logicall mistakes in one that makes such a flourish with Syllogisticall reasonings? Who ever saw in a serious writing such abundance of quotations, so generally perverted, or so little to the purpose? He vainely alledgeth above an 100 testimonies of Authours, old and new, to prove that which was never denyed by those whom he opposeth. And yet on the other side, who so confident of his owne cause, amidst such barrenes of proofe, where there was need of it, either from Scripture or approved Authours? Let those that seem to hold with him in this controversie, judge whether Mr C. be not in these respects *a Disputer, one of a thousand*, as his phrase is (l) elswhere, to another purpose. How comes it then to passe, that they that have been induced to write in defence of Presbyteriall and Classicall government, have had no other matter to work upon, but what was affoorded by Mr C. or that the cause of Independencie, which makes so great a noyse among some, yeelds yet so little to be seen for the maintenance of it? May not we justly doubt concerning others that seem to favour this way, that their judgements are not setled in this poynt; by how much they are so slow to professe, what they hold, and upon what grounds? If they agree with Mr D. and Mr C. and their grounds & pretences be the same with theirs, they may here receive satisfaction. But some happily will think the Authour hath been needlesly curious in noting the manifold grosse faylings of Mr C. both in his Reasonings and Quotations. For answer hereunto, besides that for the most part they be such as in this thorough kinde of refuting, used by the Authour, could not be passed over with silence; it appeares that Mr C. stands in need of being told of these faults; for in his latter edition of the same things, I finde not any of these foule mistakes amended. Herein onely he hath somewhat corrected himself, that what he had before (m) ascribed to *Mr Paget*, now he attributes it (n) to the *Presbyterian governours*, and *such as stand for Presbyteriall government*: hereby acknowledging that what he had before called (o) *Mr Pagets new doctrine*, (p) *Mr Pagets lately-devised Tenets*, (q) *Mr Pagets new opinion*, was neither his device, nor sole opinion, but common with him to at least all that allow of the government of the Church of Scotland; from whom that Mr C. might professe his dissent, he hath put in the words *Presbyteris*, and *Presbyterian*, with *Classis*, and *Classicall*, seeing the *Presbyteries* in Scotland are in effect the same with the *Classes* in these countries.

For the publishing of this Treatise, I had more need to plead excuse for not setting

(k) Edinb. 1641.

* August. de Trin. l. 1, c. 3.

See afterw. p. 145, 146. &c.

(l) Ch. pl. Pr 15.

(m) Chur. plea, p. 74.

(n) Syons prer. roy. p. 16, 21.

(o) Ch. pl. p. 71.

(p) Ibid. p. 77.

(q) Ibid. p. 81.

ſetting it forth before, according to their judgement who have frequently called upon me and encouraged me unto the finiſhing of this talke; rather then to provide againſt their diſpleaſure, who are apt to cenſure as unſeaſonable what in this kinde is unwelcome unto them. But for the ſeaſonablenes of it, let the times ſpeak. And for the delay, occaſioned partly by the difficulty of the work, and partly by other diſtractions, & want of neceſſary helps for diſpatch, the book itſelf unto thoſe that are not unacquainted with buſineſſes of this nature, will give reaſonable ſatiſfaction. That which thou here ſeeſt touching Claſſes and Synods, was written by the Authour in the latter dayes of his pilgrimage, amidſt ſundry bodily weakneſſes, & other neceſſary imployments. There are now three yeares expired, ſince he reſted from this & other his labours, having ſerved the will of God in his owne age, & entred into the joy of his Lord. Being warned ſome time before by a meſſenger of death to deſiſt from the purſuit of this work, he gave way that in convenient time, as I was able, I ſhould huſband theſe his notes for publick uſe. It were to have been wiſhed that his owne eye & hand might have prevented the charge of an executour herein. So ſhouldeſt thou have had this work farre more compleat and refined then now can be expected. But the Almighty, infinite in underſtanding, to whom belong the iſſues of life and death, hath ordered otherwiſe: & who will ſay unto him, What doeſt thou? According to the truſt therefore committed unto me, I doe now at length ſet foorth this monument of his godly & painfull labours touching this weighty point of Church-government. I have forborne, as much as might be, to interpoſe my rude pencill in this maſter-piece. The liberty allowed unto me for the perfiting of what was wanting, I have uſed no further then was requiſite, for the coupling of the parts together, out of ſeverall papers, written at ſeverall times, & for the filling up of a few gaps, ſpecially in *Ch.* 7. having had the opportunity to meet with ſome bookes which the Authour wanted. I have withall added a ſmall Supplement, for anſwer unto what remained in Mr Cannes book, touching this poynt, according to the firſt edition, the ſame which the Authour onely ſaw & followed in this his Defence. And thus I have alſo caſt my mite into this Treaſury, before I opened it for publick benefit. If my coine be not currant, let not that prejudice the rich ſupply that may be had out of the Authours ſtore; the value whereof will ſufficiently diſcover itſelf, unto them that with underſtanding & unpartiall mindes receive it. Howbeit, thou art allowed & deſired according to the Authours meaning, to bring it to the touchſtone of trueth, to the Law, & to the Teſtimony. According this word try the reaſons on both ſides, and hold faſt that which is good. Farewell, from DORT: Where a moſt pregnant & effectuall teſtimonie hath been given, for the needfull authority of Synods; with which teſtimony the Authour hath cloſed his writing touching this ſubject: Where this his Treatiſe now comes to light; which we hope may prove uſefull to direct unto the like remedy, where the like caſe may require it. He that hath the Starres in his right hand, ſo guide the beames of this Candle, now ſet upon the Candleſtick, that it may give light unto all that are in the houſe; that the darke corners of errour may be further diſcloſed, & the luſtre of his owne Ordinances become more apparent. With this ſuit I againe take leave, requeſting thee to joyne therein with him that deſires to be

Thine in trueth,

R. PAGET.

THE FIRST PART OF THIS TREATISE,

Touching

The Power of a particular Elderſhip.

CHAP. I.

The occaſion of this vvriting, and the State of the Queſtion.

WHereas Mr Ainſworth was deſired by the Authour (a) to ſet down his reaſons concerning whatſoever he thought might be a juſt cauſe of refuſing communion with that particular Congregation whereof he was a Miniſter: Mr Ainſw. in his anſwer among the reſt hath (b) theſe words; *Other things there are, wherein you know we differ from you: &c. Your Elderſhip ſitteth & judgeth matters apart from the Congregation: &c.* Concerning which particular the „ Authour thus (c) replyed: Though our Elderſhip for „ the examination of parties & witneſſes, and for their conſultations thereabout „ do ſit apart, as is meet; yet do we not exclude or debarre any from hearing & „ ſeeing the conviction of any ſinne that is either publique of it ſelf or perſiſted in, „ when they deſire the ſame: yea we our ſelves have oft deſired their preſence to „ behold the convictions, admonitions & rebukes of offenders. And further, be- „ fore any ſentence be given for the cutting off of any offender, we do firſt pro- „ pound the matter unto the whole Church, requiring their prayers, adviſe and „ conſent, without which never yet any judgment of excommunication hath bene „ executed againſt any amongſt us: and this alſo is propounded unto them by di- „ vers degrees, long & oft before any pronouncing of ſentence, that ſo our bre- „ thren may have ſufficient time, both to informe themſelves of the matter and to „ deliberate ripely thereof. &c.

(a) Arrow ag. Sep. f. 2. v.

(b) Ibid. pag. 5.

(c) Ibid. p. 32.

Mr Ainſworth in his next having (d) ſayd, I *put you in minde that you have not as yet alledged any one word of God, for your Conſiſtory, &c.* the Authour puts him in minde of his owne allowing the ſame by communicating therewith in ſome meaſure, whereof he had bene told (e) before, & whereunto he anſwered not a word, „ and addes (f) further: Seeing you have not yet anſwered, neither the (g) firſt „ nor the (h) laſt booke of Mr Iohnſon, wherein he hath written againſt your po- „ pular government, what meane you to call for more? if more be requiſite, you „ may ſee that I promiſed you in my former (i) writing that when I ſhould receive „ any arguments from you to prove your refuſall of communion upon theſe „ grounds, that I would then give further anſwer unto you. The errours which „ you

(d) Ibid p. 317.

(e) Ibid. p. 32.

(f) Ibid p. 330.

(g) Exp. of Matt. 18.

(h) Chriſtian plea.

(i) Arrow ag. Sep p. 33.

„ you have published in your *Animadversion* for the maintenance of your popular „ order, and the enormities which in that order are committed by you in your un- „ lawfull excommunications & censures, are so many that they require a distinct „ treatise for the refutation thereof: of which I purpose to say more hereafter as „ occasion is given. &c. Hereupon and about the same time was written that which followes, though not happily all that was intended.

By that which is sayd it may appeare that the Question is not, whether the power of the keyes be given to the Church, or whether the power of excommunication be in the body of the Church, or whether Church-government ought to be with the peoples free consent, &c. All this may be granted, and yet the point in controversy remaine undecided. But the difference is about the execution & judiciall exercising of this power: Whether every offence to be judged or cause to be determined, ought to be brought to the multitude or body of the Congregation, and they to give their voyces therein together with the Officers of the Church; or whether the Officers being chosen with the publick knowledge and free consent of the Church, have not by vertue of their calling power to heare & judge matters, to rebuke and censure offenders without the advise of the multitude; yet so that in matters of greater importance & more publick concernmẽt (as admissions, excommunications & absolutions of members, elections & depositions of Officers, &c.) the case be made knowne unto & determined with the free consent of the people, according to the practise above-written. The former of these is denyed, the latter affirmed & maintained in the ensuing discourse.

CHAP. II.

Arguments to prove the power of the Eldership in judging, & ending some causes without the knowledge of the Congregation.

I.

THe titles given by the holy Ghost to Ecclesiasticall Offices & Officers are such as import a power of judging causes; being such titles as doe expresse & declare the power of judgement, which was in the Rulers of Israel, both Civill & Ecclesiasticall: as for example;

Ἡγού-μενος. 1. A *Guide* or *Leader*, is the title given to Ecclesiasticall Officers, *Heb.* 13. 7.17.24. & is the same that in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, agreeable to the Originall, is given to Civill Rulers, *Ioſh.* 13.21. *Deut.* 1.13. *Mica.* 3.9, 11. 2. *Chro.* 5.1. *Ezek.* 44.3. & 45.7. *Dan.* 3.2. as also in the New Testament, *Act.* 7.10. Besides it is the same with another word so often given unto Civill Rulers, *Mat.* 2.6. & 27.2. *Act.* 23.24,26,33. 1. *Pet.* 2.14. &c. And so is this word also used by other humane writers abundantly.

Ἡγε-μών.

Ἐπίσ-κοπος. 2. A *Bishop* or *Overseer*, the title given by the H. Ghost unto Ecclesiasticall Officers to describe their authority & power, *Act.* 20.28. *Phil.* 1.1. 1. *Tim.* 3.2. *Tit.* 1.7. is the same word that is given to expresse the power of Civill Magistrates in the

the Greek translation of the Old Testament, *Num.*31.14. *Iudg.*9.28. 2.*Kin.*11.15. and very often in other Writers.

3. An *Elder*, the title which the Scripture useth to denote & shew the office of Ecclesiasticall Elders, *Act.*14.23. & 15.2,4. & 20.17. 1.*Tim.*5.17. *Tit.*1.5. 1.*Pet.* 5.1. is the same word which is likewise given to Civill Rulers & Elders in the gate, *Iudg.*8.14. *Ruth.*4.2,3. &c. 2.*Sam.*5.3. 1.*Chron.* 11.3. Πρεσβύτερος.

4. A *Prince* or *Ruler*, being the title of Civill Governours in the Commonwealth, to signify their authority, *Num.*7.2. *Gen.*25.16. & 34.2. *Levit.* 4.22. *Rom.* 13.3. 1.*Cor.*2.6. is also given to Ecclesiasticall Rulers to note their office and authority, as *Act.*23.5. *with Exod.*22.28. *Mat.*9.18. *Luk.* 8.41. *Ioh.*3.1. *Num.* 3.24, 30, 32, 35. And hereby it may appeare how untrue it is which Mr Robinson writes concerning the difference betwixt Civill Officers & Church-governours, when having mentioned some of the titles given to Magistrates, he saith; (a) *Ecclesiasticall Officers are not capable of these & the like titles, which can neither be given without flattery unto them, nor received by them without arrogancy*: And yet the very first of the titles wherein he gives instance, is that title which here I shew to be given to Ecclesiasticall Rulers as well as to Civill. Ἀρχων *Nasi.* (a) Justific. of Sep. p. 135.

5. The title of *Heads*, wherein Mr Robinson (b) instanceth in the second place, that it may not be given to Ecclesiasticall Officers, is yet (if we will regard what the Scripture affirmeth) given to them as well as to Civill Rulers. As it is given to Magistrates in *Deut.* 1.15. the place alledged by Mr Robinson, so is it also given to Ministers in 1.*Chron.*15.12. & 23.24. & 24.4. & 26.10,12. 2.*Chron.* 19.11. *Ezra*, 8.1,17. *Nehem.*12.12,22,23,24. *Rosch* (b) Justific. ibid.

6. The title of *Governours* or *Governments*, which the Greekes are (c) noted to use to expresse the power of Civill Magistrates thereby, by a Metaphor from pilots, out of Xenophon, Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, &c. is the same that the holy Ghost also useth to signify unto us thereby the authority of Church-governours in guiding the ship of Christs Church. 1.*Cor.*12.28. Κυβερνήσεις. (c) Steph. Thes. ling. Gr.

7. The title of *Rulers*, which H. Stephanus (d) shewes to be used by Thucydides, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Plato, Plutarch, & others for the Rulers of Cities, of Armies, & Kingdomes, is that same which the Scripture useth to describe unto us those Officers that beare rule in the Church, which is the City of the living God and his spirituall Kingdome. *Rom.*12.8. 1.*Thes.* 5.12. 1.*Tim.*5.17. Προϊστάμενοι. Προεστῶς. (d) Thesaur. l. Gr.

8 The title of (e) *Gods*, which is so often used to expresse the dignity and authority of Civill Governours, *Psal.* 82.1. *Exo.*21.6. & 22.8. 1.*Sam.* 2.25. &c. is also given to Ecclesiasticall Officers to declare & signify the authority that they have. Though Mr Robinson (f) denyes this title also unto them; yet if we diligently weigh what the Scripture saith, we may well discerne that this title is also given to Church-governours & Ministers. for 1. The description of those persons to whom this title is given, is that they are such, *to whom the word of God comes*; such as *the Father hath sanctifyed & sent*: Joh. 16. 35,36. and therefore according to the exposition of our Saviour, seeing the word of God is come unto Ecclesiasticall Ministers & Rulers, giving them thereby a commission to administer in his name; seeing such are sanctifyed & sent of God, we may hereby see how this (e) *Elohim.* (f) Justif. of Sep. p. 135.

title belongs unto them. 2. By the expoſition & application of the Apoſtle, thoſe who in Moſes are called *Gods & Rulers*, *Exod.* 22.28. are ſhewed to be Eccleſiaſticall Rulers, *Act.* 23.5. And howſoever ſome differ about this title, yet are there of the learnedeſt that doe (g) ſo interpret theſe places, viz. *of ſuch as have either Civill or Eccleſiaſticall adminiſtration committed unto them.* And if we come unto thoſe Authors that are ſo much honoured by you, they will alſo confirme the ſame. The (h) Chaldee Paraphraſt upon thoſe places where this title of *God* is given to Moſes, tranſlateth it *Rab*, a *Maſter* or *Doctour*, which is ſuch a word as is given unto Eccleſiaſticall Miniſters. Others (i) of the learnedeſt Iew-doctours doe expound that title of the Prieſts & Levites, & ſo apply it to Church-governours. Another (k) Cabaliſt often alledged in your Annotations doth ſhew theſe *Gods* mentioned in Exo. 22. to be all kinde of Rulers over the people by his *Gematria* becauſe the numerall letters of the words, *Elohim*, *venaſi*, yeeld the ſame number with theſe, *hu dajan*, *vecol ſhehu*, ſignifying Iudges of all ſorts, the ſayd words as they are written in their owne letters, being compared together eyther joyntly or ſeverally.

(g) Iun. & Trem. Annot. on Ex. 22.28. Iun. anal. expl. Ex. 22 28. Ioan. Rainol. Cenſ. lib. Apocr. tom. 1. præl. 6.

(h) Onkelos Targum on Exo. 4. 16. & 7. 1.

(i) Aben Ezra com. on Exo. 22. 28.

(k) Baal hatturim on Exo. 22. 28.

II. If the Deacons may diſtribute ſome almes ũto the poore without the knowledge of the whole Congregation; then may the Elders alſo judge ſome cauſes without the knowledge of the whole Church. But the firſt is true. Therefore. &c.

The conſequence of the Propoſitiõ is proved by this: Becauſe the whole Church hath as much right & authority to diſpoſe of the Church-treaſure & almes, as they have to judge of the offences that are committed therein. This the Scripture ſheweth by the examples of ſundry Churches, of Antiochia, Macedonia, Achaia, &c. *Act.* 11.29,30. *Rom.* 15.25--28. 1. *Cor.* 16.3. 2. *Cor.* 8. 1. 4. 19. *Phil.* 2.25. *with* c. 4.18.

The Aſſumption is manifeſt, and your owne practiſe confirmeth it.

III. If Arbiters choſen by conſent of ſome particular perſons may judge the cauſes of wrong & injury, whether publick or private, wherein they ſtrive againſt one another; then may the Elders choſen by conſent of the whole Church, judge the cauſes & offences that ariſe, when they willingly ſubmit unto the ſame. But Arbiters ſo choſen may judge the cauſes referred unto them. Therefore the Elders may doe it alſo.

The truth of the Propoſition appeares; becauſe the free & ſolemne conſent of the Church in any electron gives authority unto ſuch perſons, either in generall or ſpeciall workes, as well as the choyſe of any particular men in their cauſes. *Act.* 14.23. *& 2. Cor.* 8.19.

The truth of the Aſſumption appeares, by the doctrine of the Apoſtle giving ſuch power of judgement unto Arbiters: 1. *Cor.* 6.4,5.

(l) H. Ainſ. Animadv. to Mr Clyfton, p. 43.

If you anſwer hereunto as you (l) elſwhere expound this place: that theſe controverſies to be referred unto Arbiters, *are for civill things of this life*; that *ſuch are not Church-matters, nor there to be heard, &c.* this is inſufficient and will not help you, ſeeing it appeares by the text that theſe Controverſies in Corinth might as well have bene ſayd to be Eccleſiaſticall cauſes as Civill, and belonging to the judgement of the Church as of the Magiſtrates or Arbiters. Had their controverſies bene touching a wound or ſtroke given, touching any ſlander or theft, which may be ſayd to be Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, as belonging to the judgement of the

Church;

Church; yet might the Apoſtle have ſayd unto them thereupon all that he doth, 1. *Cor.* 6. 1–9. for 1. Theſe are buſineſſes which Infidell Magiſtrates in thoſe times uſed to judge, and the generall ſpeech of the Apoſtle imports as much, *v.* 1. *&* 6. 2. The reaſon which the Apoſtle uſeth, taken from the honour & dignity of Saints in their judgement of Angels & the world, ſerves to perſwade them to ſubmit the judgment of ſuch cauſes to one another mutually as well as any other cauſes, *v.* 2, 3. 3. The reaſon taken from their ſhame, as if there were no wiſe men among them to judge theſe cauſes, ſerves to reprove them for a want of wiſedome in Eccleſiaſticall things as well as Civill. 4. The matters of controverſy among them were of wrong & injury done to brethren, *v.* 7, 8, 9. And theſe being ſinnes & ſcandals, belong to the judgment of the Church, as doth the judgment of * all knowne ſinnes.

* 2. Cor. 10. 4, 5, 6. 1. Cor. 5. 7.

This Argument is in effect yeelded unto by your ſelf, when you (m) allow the Articles of the Diſcipline agreed upon in the Reformed Engliſh Church which was at *Franckford* in *Q. Maries* dayes; for whereas in the 62. art. thereof, in caſe of difference betwixt the Governours of the Church & others it is there concluded, *that the body of the Congregation may appoint ſo many of the Congregation to heare & determine the ſayd matter or matters, as it ſhall ſeeme good unto the Congregation:* hereupon in approbation of this Diſcipline you obſerve, that *hereby the reader may ſee what the learned & moſt conſcionable of the Church of England held heretofore: which if they had continued in, would have freed them of all Antichriſtian Prelacy, the bane of ſo many Churches.* And hereupon I obſerve further againſt you, how the reader may hereby ſee, that if the body of the Church may appoint ſo many Arbiters as they will *to heare & determine matters*, then may the Elders of the Church receive this authority as well as any others; then is it no unlawfull uſurpation for them to heare & determine ſome matters among the brethren by themſelves.

(m) H. Ainſ. Animadv. to Mr Clyf. ton. p. 9.

IV. If particular perſons may lawfully paſſe by ſome leſſer offences & leave them unto the conſciences of the offenders, without proſequuting thē or bringing them to the Church for any judgment at all: then may the Church alſo leave ſome leſſer offences unto the judgment of the Elders. But the firſt is true.

Therefore the ſecond alſo.

The conſequence of the Propoſition is proved; becauſe God doth no more require the Church to judge of ſinnes made knowne unto the ſame, then he doth require particular perſons to proſequute and to deale againſt the offences made knowne unto them: the Scripture ſpeaking as fully & giving unto particular perſons as ample commiſſion & charge to * admoniſh and complaine of ſinne, as it doth unto the Church to judge & cenſure the ſame.

* Mat. 18. 15, 16, 17. Lev. 19. 17.

The Aſſumption is proved: 1. By expreſſe teſtimonyes of Scripture, that teach us to paſſe by ſome ſins & offences, and not to proſequute them. *Prov.* 19. 11. *Eccl.* 7. 21. 2. Particular perſons being taught to love their neighbour as themſelves, & to doe good unto all, *Levit.* 19. 18. *Matt.* 22. 39. *Rom.* 13. 9. *Gal.* 5. 14. *Iam.* 2. 8. are thereby bound to admoniſh them that are without, thoſe that are not mēbers of the ſame Church with them, but of any other eyther true or falſe, or of none. Now if this be to be done, it followes neceſſarily that the reproofes of

many lesser faults are to be omitted; because otherwise men could never discharge this duety, neither would their time suffice to performe these dueties of admonition to all such as they should finde subject thereunto both within the Church & without. Yea suppose they had no other calling to attend upon, yet could not the whole age of man be sufficient to testify effectually & in order against all such transgressions which an intelligent person might discerne to be committed dayly before his eyes, both in private & publick. 3. Even yourself seem to acknowledge this also, when touching the difference of offences you say, (i) *when offences arise, it shalbe our* glory *if we can* passe them by, *as Solomon hath sayd. But if the trespasse be such as we may not but insist upon, both for the honour of God who is offended, & soule of the sinner which is endangered, & our owne or neighbours good who are endammaged thereby: then are we bound to admonish the trespasser hereof, &c.* Doth not this distinction of offences & different manner of dealing allowed by yourself, shew that for some trespasses we are not bound to admonish the trespasser, nor to insist upon them.

(i) Com. of Saints, cap. 22. § 2. & 3.

V. If Magistrates may lawfully passe by the judgment of some lesser sinnes, then may the Church also passe by the publick censure of some lesser offences. But the Magistrates may doe it. Therefore the Church also.

The consequence of the Proposition appeareth, because the Church is not more strictly bound to judge any sinne then the Magistrate is: his commission for the judgement of all kinde of sinne, great or small, being as large as the Churches; he being ordained of God to keep all the words of his Law, to be a keeper of both Tables, and to judge all evill, according to the nature of it, as well & as farre as the Church is. *Deut.* 17. 18, 19. *Iosh.* 1. 7, 8. 1. *Kin.* 2. 3. 1. *Chron.* 28. 7, 8. & 29. 19. *Prov.* 20. 8. *Rom.* 13. 3, 4.

The Assumption appeareth likewise to be true, from the first proofe of the Assumption in the former Argument; as also from this that men are sometimes reproved for bringing their brethren before the Magistrates even in cases of injury & sinne committed against them: 1. *Cor.* 6. 1-8. whereas if they were absolutely bound to let no small offence passe without judgement, then should it also be the fault of others not to bring the same unto them; & this whether they were Christians or Infidels, the like law & charge being given unto them both.

VI. The ending of some controversies & judging of some publick offences without the knowledge of the whole Congregation, is by yourself acknowledged to be lawfull in the approbation of that Discipline in the English Church at Franckford, which was there confirmed by the Church & Magistrate. for whereas it was there agreed that (k) *if admonition with witnesses prevayled not, the offence was then to be declared to the Ministers & Elders, to whom the Congregation hath given authority to take order in such cases according to the Discipline of the Church*: that (l) *there be three degrees of Ecclesiasticall Discipline; first, that the offendour acknowledge his fault and shew himselfe penitent before the Ministers & Seniors; secondly, that if he will not so doe, as well his originall crime, as also his contempt of the Ministers & Elders who have the authority of the Church, be openly declared by one of the Ministers before the whole Congregation: &c.* that (m) *if any controversy be upon the doubtfull meaning of any word or words in the Discipline, that first it be referred to the Ministers & Seniors; & if they cannot agree thereupon, then the thing*

(k) Disc. of troub. at Franckf. pag 115. &c. art. 53.
(l) Art. 54.
(m) Art. 67.

thing to be brought and referred to the whole Congregation. Hereupon after recitall of these Articles held by the learned and most conscionable of the Church of England heretofore, you adde as I noted before in another particular, that (t) *if they had continued herein, it would have freed them of all Antichristian Prelacie, &c.* And further as you would there have it to be observed by the reader against Mr Clyfton & Mr Iohnson, in your third note upon the allegation of these Articles, so may we as fitly observe against yourself in your owne words, that *if you had looked upon the examples which your selves alledge, you might have seen your errours resisted by others, against which the Lord hath now called me also to witnesse.* (t) Animad verf. p.8.9.

CHAP. III.

A Refutation of sundry errours, vvhereupon Mr Ainsvvorth grounds their Popular Government.

The first Errour.

YOu seek to build the government of the Church upon unsure foundations, & these of sundry sorts: First in that you argue from the examples of Civill Government in the Common-wealth, to demonstrate the power of the people in the one by the authority exercised in the other. This errour is to be observed in you divers wayes.

I. In your (a) Confession of faith, and (b) Apology you describe & labour to prove the power given unto each Christian Congregation for the cutting off of any member, to be in the whole body together, from the Law of God mentioning a Civill judgment to be executed by the people of the Land in killing the man that should give his children unto Molech: *Lev.* 20.4.5. and from the commandement that bound the Israelites to bring the Blasphemer without the campe, & to stone him to death: *Lev.*24.14. But 1. These judgements were Civill & corporall punishments, not spirituall censures. 2. These were to be executed on strangers, and such as were no members of the Church, as well as upon them that were members thereof; *Lev.*20.2.*&* 24.16. 3. These were to be executed on the offendours without exception, whether they repented or not. By what manner of reasoning then can the power of Ecclesiasticall censures be deduced or demonstrate from such examples as these? (a) Art. 24. (b) Pof. 8. p.60.

II. In your (c) answer to Mr Iohnson you confesse that you alledged *Numb.* 15.33.*&* 27.2.*&* 35.12. to give light unto the Question touching the power of Excommunication, *by shewing what was the peoples right then, under the Law, and under the Magistrate; which may be more, but cannot be lesse now under the Gospel, &c.* Now those Scriptures & the examples contained therein (even as those before mentioned) doe concerne Civill judgements, pleas & controversies; as the stoning to death of the Sabbath-breaker, the dividing of inheritances and possessions unto the daughters of Zelophehad, the preserving of him that had slaine a man unawares from the avenger of blood: unlesse therefore you can shew that the power of excommunication is in all those that have power to execute the sentence of death, and of the like (c) Animad verf. p.28.

like Civill punishments, you doe in vaine alledge all these examples & wrest the word of God unjustly for the maintenance of your owne opinions.

III. This errour is so much the more inexcusable in you, in that you condemne it in others, and yet will not acknowledge and see it in yourself. When Mr Iohnson would shew the power of the Elders in Ecclesiasticall judgements by the power which the Magistrates had in Israel, you tell him that he (d) *streynes too farre*, & you alledge the testimonies of sundry learned men that disclayme such manner of arguing & say, that to reason (e) *from the Magistrate to the Minister, from the sword to the word, from the Law to the Gospell, &c. the leap is so great, that cart-ropes will not tye the conclusion to the premisses*: that *the argument is not good from Civill government to Ecclesiasticall*: and againe, *that the example is altogether unlike, of temporall empire & spirituall ministery; betweene these there is not, neither ought, neither can a proportion or comparison be rightly made.* And how then comes it now to passe, that the reasoning from the peoples power in Civill judgements unto their power in Ecclesiasticall judgements should not be as unlawfull as the reasoning from the power of Civill Elders unto Ecclesiasticall Elders? or why might not Mr Iohnson derive the power of the Elders in Ecclesiasticall matters from Civill, as well as you may derive the power of the people from Civill judgements unto the spirituall judgements of the Church?

(d) Anim. adv. p. 14.

(e) Ibid. p. 16.

IV. The excuse which you bring to colour this unsound manner of reasoning in yourself, is that (f) *the Apostle applyeth many things from Aarons priesthood* (g) *to Christ: yet he maketh Christs priesthood not to be after Aarons order* (h) *but Melchizedeks: should men now thus carp at his allegations?* But I answer, 1. When the H. Ghost in the New Testament reasoneth from types & figures in the Old, such reasoning is authenticall & infallible; but when men doe reason by proportion & similitude from types & other temporary ordinances in the Old Testament, their reasonings serve onely to illustrate things proved in other places of Scripture, but els prove nothing of themselves: and therefore though the first kinde of reasoning may not be carped at, as being divine; yet the latter may oftē justly be reproved. 2. Though some things may be applyed from the Civill government to the Ecclesiasticall; yet that shewes not that they are like in this poynt of the persons by whom the power is to be exercised: even as Aarons priesthood & Melchizedeks, though they be like in some things, yet not in all. 3. If there be any weight or worth in this evasion, it may as well serve to excuse Mr Iohnsons reasoning from the Civill authority of the Magistrates, as yours from the Civill authority of the people; both of you arguing alike from a Civill power of judgement unto an Ecclesiasticall power.

(f) Anim. adv. p. 28.

(g) Heb. 5. 4. & 9. 6, 7. & 13. 11, 12.

(h) Heb. 7. 11, 12, 15.

The Second Errour.

YOur second errour in the doctrine of Ecclesiasticall government is, that you doe not onely derive the power of the Church from the Civill authority exercised in the Common-wealth, but also from such a supposed power of Civill judgement in the people as the Scripture no where gives unto them.

1. All the places before alledged by you to this purpose doe not prove the same. As for that allegation. *Levit.* 20. 2. 4. where *the people of the land* are commanded

to

to kill an offendour; we are thereby to understand both Princes & Rulers as wel as the subjects: and so that the power of judging & giving sentence is to be ascribed unto the Rulers, as the liberty & duety of complayning before sentence, and of execution after sentence belonged unto the subjects. This word *people* is taken diversly in the Scriptures: sometimes for subjects alone by way of opposition to Princes, as *Exod.* 18. 21,22. *Num.* 11. 16,17. sometimes for the whole body of a nation comprehending Rulers of all sorts together with the subjects, as *Gen.* 25. 23. *Deut.* 4. 6,33. and when any thing is in generall commanded unto the people (taken in this sense) as here, such commandements are to be practised according to the severall callings of men; but doe not prove the like power of performing those commandements to be in all the people.

That place, *Levit.* 24. 14. shewes that the people did execute the blasphemer but shewes not that they had power to decree that sentence, or to pronounce the judgement in the first place which they executed in the last.

Those Scriptures, *Num.* 15. 33. *&* 27. 2. *&* 35. 12. doe shew that divers Civill causes were brought before the people as witnesses to heare the same decided, but not as Iudges to give sentence upon the same. Yourself speake but faintly of the matter, when you (i) plead from *Ruth*, 4. 2, 7, 9, 11. that *the people were also interested with the Elders* in these affaires: they might have interest to heare those controversies debated, but what is this to prove the power of judgement to be in the whole body of the Congregation? Besides, if such a presence of the people to heare controversies do prove a power of judgement in the people; you might as well plead that almost all Civill governments at this day are Democraticall, as in England, France & Germany, where malefactours are brought before the Iudges & before the multitudes of people assembling together at such places. (i) Anim. adv. p. 29.

Other pretences also you doe bring to obscure & diminish the authority of the Magistrates in Israel, as if they had not power to put a man to death & to cut off a man from Israel without the consent of the people, &c. but they are as the former, frivolous & insufficient.

H. AINSVV. (k) *I know, when Gods Law condemned a man, if it were shewed by all or any one of the Iudges, or Priests, or Prophets, yea or Israelites; the people should in order have executed him.* ANSVV. But what order was that for the people being subjects to take upon them the execution of judgement upon the testimony of any one of the Iudges or Priests, when all the rest both of the Iudges & Priests & Prophets did not assent? What warrant did the law of God in any place give unto the people to exercise such power of judgements upon the declaration of *any one of the Israelites*, when all the Rulers both Civill & Ecclesiasticall did make a contrary declaration, and could not so understand the law of God, as one of the Israelites had shewed it? What is this order but the plaine way to sedition & tumult? (k) Anim. adv. p. 20.

H. AINSVV. (l) *Oft times the Heads of the people judged for rewards, Mich.* 3. 11. *the Princes as Lions, the Iudges as Wolves devoured them, the Priests polluted the Sanctuary & wrested the Law. Zeph.* 3. 3, 4. *Isa.* 1. 23. *And then the people of the land, whose duety also it was to looke to open wickednes, (Levit.* 20. 2, 4.) *were neither to follow the many nor mighty in evill. Exod.* 23. 2, 7. ANSVV. 1. Oft times the people also were wicked, rebel- (l) Ibid.

rebellious, Idolatrous, Apostates, and presumptuous abettours & maintainers of evill, sometimes as bad, & sometimes worse then their Governours. *Exod.* 32.1, *etc. Numb.* 14.1-10. & 16.41.42. *Iudg.* 2.11,19. *&c.* But what is this to determine the right of authority? doth that vary & change according to the goodnes & wickednes of the persons? we are taught the contrary of God. Though the Romane Emperour in Pauls time was a Lyon, devouring many; 2. *Tim.* 4.17. yet he teacheth submission unto the authority even of such. *Rom.* 13.1,2. *&c.* Though Annas & Caiaphas & other wicked Priests & Scribes & Pharisees, were wolves, devouring widowes houses, polluting the Sanctuary & wresting the Law, (*Iohn.* 18. *Matt.* 23.) yet we are taught to acknowledge the authority of such. *Matt.* 8. 4. *Act.* 23.5. 2. Though wicked Rulers are not to be obeyed in their unlawfull commandements, and therefore the servants of Saul did well not to execute his bloody commandement (1. *Sam.* 22.17.) wherein for one act he ravened as the wolfe of Benjamin: *Gen.* 49.27. yet the authority remained in him, & not in those that disobeyed him. Subjection unto authority is shewed, if not by obedience, yet by patience in suffering according to the will of God, if need require. 3. But that any of the people which are subjects, should goe further to execute Civill judgements when the Rulers neglect justice, this is not proved by *Lev.* 20.2,4. The people their mentioned are not the subjects considered apart from their Rulers: but under the title of the *children of Israel* there spoken unto, are comprehended principally the Princes of the people & Rulers of Israel. The other people if they did mourne in themselves & complaine unto others for the redresse of such evils, were not to be blamed; but had the marke of Gods favour upon them. *Ezek.* 8.6. *with Exth.* 9.4.

(m) Animadv. p. 20.

H. AINSVV. (m) *I finde how in Naboths case (though it were a wicked fact) there was a solemn fast and assembly of the people with their Governours.* 1. *Kin.* 21.12,13. ANSVV. But you finde not one word there to prove any power in the people either to condemne or to absolve & acquit Naboth. The presence of the people is noted, but the killing of Naboth is ascribed unto the Elders and Nobles of the city, according to that which Iezebel required of them. *Ibid. vers.* 9,10,11.

(n) Ibid.

H. AINSVV. (n) *In Ieremies case, he was accused to the Princes and people, made his defence to Princes & people, and was acquitted by Princes & people. Ierem.* 26.11,12,16. ANSVV. This action was partly tumultuous at the first, not much unlike that when Paul was so violently haled and accused unto the people, *Act.* 21.27,28. And when it grew into order by help of the Princes, it appeares that the authority of judgment was in the Rulers. for 1. The Princes are expressely named in each part of the action, in the accusation brought to them, in hearing the defence & in giving of the sentence; and therefore nothing was done without their authority. 2. Whereas there is mention made of the people together with the Princes, *vers.* 11,16. there some learned (o) Interpreters doe translate it for explication, *Senioris populi*, that is, *the Elders of the people*: and this agreeth with the text, *vers.* 17. where there is mention of the Elders of the land rising up out of their seats and speaking to the multitude, as well as the Princes of the Court that came up from the Kings house, *vers.* 10, 16. Even in that part of the Government which was

(o) Trem. & Iun. in Ier. 26. See also Corn. Bertr. de Polit. Iud. cap. 6. & 11.

De-

Democraticall and popular, yet were there some Rulers representing the people, 3. Persons accused doe sometimes speake to their accusers for refutation of them, as Ieremy here might doe unto a multitude of the people that had dealt so unjustly with him, *vers.* 8,9. and yet without allowing them to have authority in giving sentence against him.

H. AINSVV. (p) *When King Saul sware that Ionathan should dye, the people sware the contrary, & saved him from death. 1. Sam. 14. 39. 44. 45.* ANSVV. 1. It is not evident and certaine that the people did peremptorily swear the contrary; for according to the translation of learned (q) Interpreters, the words in the text may be read, not by way of absolute affirmation but by way of interrogation on this manner, *as the Lord liveth, ought there an haire to fall from his head?* whereby it is understood that the people did adjure Saul appealing unto his conscience before the living God, that he would have regard of right & equity rather then of his oth, &c. And this agrees with the judgement which some are (r) noted to have hereof, viz. that the people by intreating & perswading of Saul did save Ionathan rather then by force. 2. By *the people* in that place we are to understand not the common people onely, but all the Princes & Rulers of the people, whose authority in such case is more then of a multitude of other people; and this is manifest in the text, *vers.* 40,41. where in casting of the lot, All Israel was set on the one side, and Saul with Ionathan on the other side, so that all the Nobles and Governours of Israel, all beside Saul and his sonne were there included under the name of *the people.* 3. This case was also extraordinary, the question being not onely about the Kings sonne & his Eldest sonne, but such a sonne, as with whom God had wrought miraculously at the same time for the preservation of Israel. It was no wonder if upon such occasion the people did take unto themselves more liberty and power then ordinary, which at other times in common cases they durst not have done.

(p) Anim. adv. p. 20.

(q) Trem. & Iun in 1. Sam. 14.

(r) Pet. Mart. on 1. Sam. 14.

H. AINSVV. (s) *When the High-Priests & Scribes would have killed Christ, they feared the people. Luc. 20. 19. & 22. 2.* ANSVV. They feared the people, not because they should have encroached upon the authority of the people, if they had killed him; but because of the shame & danger which they feared would ensue upon the unjust oppression of so holy & innocent a person. Herod feared the people when he would have put Iohn to death, and yet this argues no want of absolute and sole authority in himself to execute that judgement when he listed. *Matth.* 14. 5--11. And so at this day many cruell persecutours doe feare the people, and their rage is in part brideled, while they have absolute and full authority in their hands to execute judgment according to the forme of their government; onely the shame of injustice & cruelty restraines them: as on the contrary they are bolder to exercise their authority and cruelty, when they see that it pleaseth the people, as *Act.* 12. 2,3. & 24. 27.

(s) Anim. adv. p. 20.

H. AINSVV. (t) *The people as well as the Rulers, were called before Pilate about Christs death, Luk. 23. 13. and by their voyces prevayled, Matt. 27. 20. 22. 25. 26. Luk. 23. 23.* ANSVV. 1. The people were called before Pilate with the Priests & Scribes, as being the accusers of Christ, *Luk.* 23. 1, 2, 4, 5. *Ioh.* 19. 12. but this calling of them proves no part of their power in the judgement. 2. Pilate being a corrupt

(t) Ibid.

Iudge, & yet being convinced in his conſcience of the innocency of Chriſt, partly to ſhew how willing he was to favour and content the Iewes, and partly to ſtop the clamour & teſtimony of his owne conſcience, doth call them before him to trye if he could perſwade them to ſtay & ceaſe their action, uſing many arguments and deviſes to that purpoſe. 3. Moreover Pilate called the people with the Rulers before him, to know what priſoner they would have releaſed unto them at the feaſt according to a corrupt cuſtome among them, *Mat.* 27. 15. And that very cuſtome it ſelf of releaſing one priſoner at the feaſt, whom they would, & that upon their requeſt, *Mark.* 15. 6, 8. was an evidence of the peoples want of power in judgement: for had they had authority to have judged & determined ſuch matters, what needed they to have petitioned to Pilate, or what favour had it bene in the Romane Governour to have granted that unto them for one perſon at one ſpeciall time, which they might have done of their owne authority at any time? 4. Though it be ſayd, that they *prevayled* with their *voyces*, this is to be underſtood of their importunate requeſt and voyces of petition, as is noted in the ſame place, and not of their ſuffrages or giving of voyces with authority in the ſentence of judgement: as the importunate widow prevayled with the unrighteous Iudge, *Luk.* 18. 5. ſo did the Iewes prevayle with Pilate, by their importunate requeſts, cryes & clamours in begging Barabbas of Pilate & deſiring him to crucify Chriſt. *Act.* 3. 14. 5. This condemnation of Chriſt was done by the Romane authority; the Iewes confeſſe that it was *not Lawfull for them to put any man to death*; *Ioh.* 18. 31. the ſcepter was now departed from Iuda; *Luk.* 2. 1. *&c.* they acknowledged *no King but Cæſar*; *Ioh.* 19. 15. and Pontius Pilate a Romane Governour under Cæſar gave ſentence of death upon Chriſt; the people of the Iewes were now vaſſals to the Romanes and had not the power pretended: when you therefore ſend to this example, you ſend us to Rome & to the Romiſh government, and not unto that order and policie which God had commanded and planted among his owne people.

(v) Animadv. p. 20. II. Whereas you ſay, (v) it is not manifeſted that the Magiſtrates in Iſrael had in themſelves full & abſolute power to cut off a man or to put him to death, &c. the contrary may be ſhewed: Firſt, by the example of David, who as he reſolved & profeſſed for himſelf, that he would *cut off all the workers of iniquity from the city of the Lord*: *Pſal.* 101. 8. ſo when occaſion was given he preſently condemned the Amalekite to death for ſlaying Saul; 2. *Sam.* 1. 15. he by his owne authority appointed Baanah & Rechab to be ſlaine for killing Iſhboſheth, without gathering any aſſembly to aſke the peoples conſent. 2. *Sam.* 4. 8.-12. When David heard from Nathans parable of a rich man oppreſſing the poore, he forthwith pronounced the ſentence of death againſt that oppreſſour, not waiting for the counſell or conſent of the people, though in a rare & unuſuall caſe. 2. *Sam.* 12. 5, 6. When the woman of Tekoah makes requeſt for her ſonne that he might be abſolved in judgement and delivered from the ſentence of death, David preſently by his owne authority decrees that he ſhall be pardoned, and confirmes it with an oath, he ſtayes not for approbation from the people. 2. *Sam.* 14. 4.-11. Againe if we looke upon the way of his ſonne after him, we ſee the ſame thing, even in Salomon; and that both in his

his doctrine, where he teacheth that the power of life & death is in the hand of the King; *Prov.* 16. 14,15. & 20. 2,26. and in his practiſe he confirmed the ſame, in the judgement & ſentence of death, which he forthwith decreed & pronounced upon Adoniah, & ſwore to have the ſame accompliſhed preſently without aſking conſent of the people. 1. *King.* 2. 23,24,25.

III. If the Magiſtrates in Iſrael had not in themſelves authority to put a malefactour to death without conſent of the people, then doe you unjuſtly blame that proportion that might be made betwixt the Elders in the gate and Elders in the Church, betwixt Magiſtrates and Miniſters; then doe you unjuſtly impugne the ſame (x) as a *diſproportion & ſtreyned too farre*: for if the Magiſtrates in Iſrael did but guide & governe the action in Civill judgements, as (y) Mr Robinſon in his anſwer recorded by you doth note of the Iudges of Aſſiſes in England & even of the Lord Cheef-Iuſtice himſelf with his Bench, wiſhing alſo that the Eccleſiaſticall Elders, whom he & you oppoſe, *would allow the body of the Church the like liberty at their ſpirituall Seſſions*, that thoſe Iudges allow unto the country or Iury in the judgment of malefactours: if the Magiſtrates in the Common-wealth might not decree the ſentence of judgement without conſent of the people, no more then the Miniſters in the Church without conſent of the Congregation; if the Miniſters in the Church might governe the action and the people in their judgements as well as the Elders in the gate; is there not then here an even & manifeſt proportion both of government & power betwixt the one & the other?

(x) Anim. adv. p. 14, 15, 16, 19, &c.
(y) Ibid. p. 113.

IV. If the power of judgements & giving ſentence of life & death were not in the Magiſtrates in Iſrael, then doe you contradict the teſtimony of the Iew-doctours out of their Thalmud alledged not onely by (z) Beza & many others, but by your (a) ſelf alſo in the deſcription of their ſeverall Courts & the authority which they exerciſed in the ſame. Yea you doe more plainly yet contradict yourſelf, when afterward from the teſtimonies of Scripture alledged by Mr Iohnſon you doe againe (b) confeſſe that the Magiſtrates in Iſrael *had power of life & death.*

(z) Annot. on Matt. 5. 22.
(a) Anim. adv. p. 17.
(b) Ibid. p. 18, 19.

The third Errour.

A Third errour in the proofe of the Churches power, is in that you derive the ſame from other unſound proportions of the ceremoniall obſervation in Iſrael: Though you yourſelf doe acknowledge againſt Mr Johnſon that the drawing of proportions from the government in Iſrael is one of the (c) *maine pillars of Popery, to underprop the tower of Antichriſt*; yet the trueth is that neither Mr Iohnſ. nor Cardinall Bellarmine himſelf doe gather more unequall proportions for their ſupremacies which they plead for, then you doe.

(c) Anim. adv. pref. 2. & p. 15.

I. Whereas you would prove (d) the power of excommunication to be in the whole body of every Chriſtian Congregation, and not in any one member apart, or in more members ſequeſtred from the whole, &c. and ſeek to prove this by a proportion drawne from the government in Iſrael, becauſe as you argue from *Numb.* 5. 2,3. *not the Prieſt onely, but the children of Iſrael were charged to put the Leper out of the hoſt*: This proportion faileth, unleſſe you could ſhew that the Prieſts wanted authority to pronounce this judgement of excluding a leper out of the hoſt, untill they had the conſent of the people. We ſee the contrary; namely that

(d) Confeſſ. art. 24. Ap. p. 62. Anim. adv. p. 20.

the Priests discerning and judging the lepers, and others executing their decree might lawfully remoove the leper: for 1. The Priest did not onely declare by way of teaching & informing who was uncleane (as you (e) seeme to insinuate) but also by their sentence of judgement, & by their power to censure; therefore is the Priest sayd to make him polluted or to make him cleane, *Lev.* 13.3.6. &c. in such (f) phrases as in their full signification doe expresse unto us the judiciall sentence of their remoovall out of the host, as well as a bare declaration of their opinion in the matter: even as the like use of other phrases in the Scripture, *Deut.* 25.1. *Prov.* 17.15. signifying to (g) make just & to make wicked doe also import the judiciall sentence of absolution & condemnation, & not onely a declaration of the Iudges opinion thereabouts. 2. It is noted of the Priest, that in doubtfull cases, in the tryall of the leprosy, he should shut up him that had the plague seven daves: *Levit.* 13.4.5. now as he had the power of suspension in a doubtfull case to *shut up* for a time; so by your owne doctrine it will follow that in a manifest case of leprosy he had the power of *shutting out* the leper, untill the time that he was cleane. 3. The Lord requires the like submission & subjection unto the judgement & sentence of the Priests in matters of controversy betweene plague & plague, as he doth unto the Iudge in his judgements: *Deut.* 17.8--13. and therefore as the Iudges had the power of judgement & giving sentence Civilly; so had the Priests power of judgement Ecclesiastically. 4. Whereas you (h) shew every member of the Church to be subject unto the censure of excommunication by alledging, 2. *Chron.* 26.20. you may thereby discerne the weaknes of your proportion for the power of the people; for in that storye you see how the King Vzziah so soone as his leprosy appeared, was hastily remooved & caused to depart out of the Temple, and this by the authority of the Priests, without waiting to ask the consent of the people. And therefore if Ministers & Elders have now as much power to excommunicate, as the Priests had then to remoove that Leper, then your proportion for the people vanisheth as a smoak. 5. Though the children of Israel be commanded to put the Leper out of the campe, *Num.* 5.2. yet is the practise thereof to be understood according to the diversity of mens callings, namely so that the Priests did put out the Leper, by giving sentence & pronouncing him uncleane; the people by complaining & bringing the matter unto the Priest in the first place & helping to execute it in the last place. 6. Whereas you grant a proportion herein thus farre, (i) *that as every Priest then might according to the Law, declare what was leprosy; so every Minister now may & ought by the law to declare what is sinne & heresy, & this though it be without or against the consent of the Church & of all the world*: your grant herein is nothing worth, while you grant as much both to the Prophets & people under the Law as well as to the Priests, and to the Prophets & people now as well as to the Ministers & Elders. The declaration of sinne, the triall & conviction of sinne you doe now allow to one as well as to the other. Lastly, as the Lord commands the children of Israel to remoove the leper out of the campe, so he gives them the like charge for those that were defiled by the dead or by uncleane issues: *Numb.* 5.2. And yet who will say that the judgement & dayly administration of these actions did belong unto the multitude of the Congregation, or that they were bound to come

(e) Ibid. p. 19,20.

(f) *timme, tihar.*

(g) *hitsdik, hirshiagn.*

(h) Confes. art. 25.

(i) Anim-adv. p. 19, 20.

come together in a ſolemne aſſembly upon ſuch occaſions of remooving theſe perſons & receyving them againe at their cleanſing? The law of their purification requires no ſuch thing. *Num.* 19.18,19. *Levit.* 15.13,14, *&c.* And therefore howſoever the act of remooving theſe uncleane perſons in the time of the Law may be held as a generall type to ſhew the excluſion of wicked perſons frō the holy things of God under the Goſpel; yet the perſons by whom theſe Legall & Ceremoniall ſeparations were ordinarily adminiſtred & performed, cannot ſerve for a ſufficient proofe that obſtinate ſinners are to be cenſured and remooved by the whole Congregation aſſembled for that purpoſe.

II. Another of your wreſted proportions from the practiſe of Iſrael, you may ſee in your Apology, where you labour to prove that the power of Excommunication is in the body of the Church by this reaſon becauſe (k) *the duety of putting away leaven out of their houſes at the feaſt of Paſſeover & unleavened bread was by the Lord himſelf layd upon all Iſrael, and not committed or injoyned onely to the Officers.* 1. *Cor.* 5. 7, 12,13. *compared with Exod.* 12.3,15. *Lev.* 23.2,5,6. *Deut.* 16.1-4. Hereunto I anſwer. 1. If the power of Excommunication be in the members of the Church now, as the power of putting away leaven was in the Iſraelites of old: then as every particular Iſraelite under the Law had power of himſelf to remoove leaven out of his houſe, yea & was bound to doe the ſame whether the reſt of the Congregation conſented or not, as appeares in the places of Scripture here alledged by yourſelf; ſo now in like manner every particular member of the Church ſhould have power in his hand to excommunicate & remoove a wicked man out of the Congregation, whether the reſt of his brethren conſented or not. 2. If you further intend that as each Iſraelite for himſelf was to put away leaven, ſo alſo he was to looke to others that they did the ſame, this I grant ſo farre as the meanes of admonition, exhortation and complaint might reach; but that the Iſraelites had all of them judiciall authority and power to judge thoſe that offended herein, (about which authority the queſtion is) the Scriptures by you alledged doe not prove the ſame. 3. As for that place, 1. *Cor.* 5.7. where the Apoſtle ſhewes that the inceſtuous perſon ought to be excommunicate by an alluſion unto the ceremony of purging out the leaven; he therein onely teacheth the duety that is to be done, but as for the authority of the perſons by whō the cenſure was to be executed, though he teach them that alſo in other verſes of that chapter, yet doth he not derive the ground thereof from the ceremony of the leaven put away: therein is your errour to ſtretch & rack the proportion too farre.

(k) Apol. p. 62.

The fourth Errour.

IN the fourth place, your warrant & ground for the peoples power is inſufficient, when as you derive the ſame from that ſeparation which you ſay was appointed of God before the Law. This you teach, whē as you would confirme the ſame unto us from (l) *the truth & proofes of the third Poſition* in your Apology, where among other teſtimonyes of Scripture you would prove your Separation by theſe allegations, *Gen.* 4.16.26. *with* 6.2. *&* 9.27. *&* 12.1. *&* 13.6,7,8. *Exod.* 5.3. But theſe Scriptures doe neither juſtify your kinde of Separation, though they be often perverted by you to that purpoſe; & much leſſe doe they ſhew unto us that the pow-

(l) Apol p. 62. poſ 8. with p. 41. poſ 3.

er

er of Excommunication is in the body of the Church.

As for *Gen.* 4. 16. where it is ſayd that *Cain* went out from the preſence of the Lord: 1. It is uncertaine whether it was by an excommunication from the place of Gods word & publick worſhip: Many are ſayd to be caſt out of Gods preſence, as we read ſometimes of Iſrael & Iudah, though we cannot ſay that they were then excommunicate. 2. *Kin.* 17, 18. 20. 23. & *Ier.* 52. 3. &c. Though the face of God doe ſometimes ſignify his all-ſeeing providence & government from which none can flee, *Pſal.* 139. 7. 12. *Ier.* 23. 24. as you doe (m) write; yet your reaſoning there is imperfect, becauſe the face of God doth ſignify divers other things beſides his all-ſeeing providence & the place of his worſhip, as namely his more comfortable preſence & providence, &c. *Pſal.* 30. 7. *with Iob*, 29. 2, 3, 4. whereof men may be deprived though not by excommunication. 2. Suppoſe Cain was excommunicate, yet this proves not the Separation you plead for. you cannot deny but that excommunication of murderers and ſuch like is ſometimes practiſed in divers Churches, whom yet you will not allow for a ſeparate people according to your profeſſion. 3. With what colour of a juſt conſequence will you collect that the power of excommunication is in the body of the Church, from this proof of your third poſition? how doth Cains ſeparation demonſtrate unto us the peoples power in Eccleſiaſticall cenſures?

(m) Annot. on Gen. 4. 16.

As for *Gen.* 4. 26. when Sheth begate his ſonne & named him Enoſh, and when (according to your tranſlation) men began profanely to call on the name of the Lord: 1. Your reaſoning upon this verſe is unwarrantable, when as you ſay, that (n) *the ſorowes of this age were great, as the very name of* Enos *teſtifyeth and the hiſtorie following in Gen.* 6. *confirmeth*: for neither is the name of *Enos* a witneſſe of great ſorowes in that age any more then the name of *Henoch*, given both to the poſterity of Cain & Sheth (*Gen.* 4. 17. & 5. 18.) is a witneſſe of the great holines or catechiſing in their age, or the name of *Iſaac* a witneſſe of the great joy and gladnes of that age, or any more then the name of Enos given to every man is a witneſſe of the ſorowes of every age: *Pſal.* 8. 4. & 144. 3. neither doth the ſtory following in *Gen.* 6. confirme unto us the ſorowes of Enos his age & birth, going a thouſand yeares before the ſame, any more then the ſtory following in Zedekias his time confirmeth unto us that there were great ſorowes in the dayes of David. 2. As for your Separation & the power of the people in excommunicating, as you note in your *Apology*, who can deviſe or comprehend how they ſhould be derived hence? How can you account thoſe things proved unto us, for which there is not ſo much as a ſhew of any conſequence in the places alledged?

(n) Annot. on Gen. 4. 26.

As for *Gen.* 6. 2. where it is recorded how the ſonnes of God tooke unto them wives of the daughters of men according to their luſt; I would faine ſee how by any lawfull argument you can hence conclude either your Separation, or the peoples power in excommunicating: when your argument appeares in the forme of it, it will then be time enough to ſhape an anſwer unto it. In the meane time, whereas you (o) note that by *the daughters of men are meant they of Kains poſteritie, that were of Gods Church, &c.* you might as well have ſayd that they had bene of Sheths poſteritie, which was alſo degenerate, ſo that for their wickednes they were ſwept away

(o) Annot. on Ge. 6, 2.

away with the flood & destroyed as well as Cains posteritie, Noahs family onely excepted. Who can say that the posterity of Cain for more then a thousand yeares together were strangers from the Church of God, during the time of so many Patriarkes; or that some of Sheths posterity also did not cease to be the Church of God? And if the testimony of your Hebrew doctours were to be admitted, I might easily shew you many of them that tell us of Cains repentance, & consequently of the receiving of him & his posterity into the Church of God. Yea if Naamah was the wife of Noah as they (p) presume, you might then observe the posterity of Cain living still after the flood in her that was the daughter of Lamech, on Cains side.

(p) R. Solomon com. on Gen. 4. 22.

Touching *Gen.* 9. 27. though Iaphet was to be perswaded to dwell in the tents of Shem, &c. yet how are we to be perswaded thence touching the forme of government among them, and that the power of excommunication was in the people, rather then in any Rulers among them? These bare allegations of Scripture help you nothing untill you draw some argument from them to shew the matter in controversy, which yet is not done by you.

Touching *Gen.* 12. 1. where Abram is called out of his native country: 1. That place is strangely abused by you for your Separation, seeing Abram there is called to travell he knowes not whither, unto a land which God would afterwards shew and give unto him, (*Hebr.* 11. 8. *Genes.* 12. 1.) without any mention of separating or joyning unto any Church. And the land of Canaan unto which he came appeares to have bene as Idolatrous at that time, & more manifestly accursed then that of the Chaldæains from whence he came. *Gen.* 9. 25, 26, 27. 2. With what kinde of arguing can you shew us the peoples power in judgements & censures of sinne from this ground? This we desire to know & wait for. Yet to make you more circumspect against that time, consider in the meane while the errour of your Annotations touching this calling of Abram, *Gen.* 12. 1. 1. When as concerning the time you write that it was (q) *after that Abrams father was dead*, *Act.* 7. 4. this your assertion is unwarrantable and without proofe: Though it be manifest from *Act.* 7. 4. that God brought Abram from *Charran* after his father was dead; yet this shewes not that the calling mentioned in *Gen.* 12. 1. was after his fathers death. 2. Whereas you note further upon the same verse, touching the place from which Abram was called, *Gen.* 12. 1. that it was *that country wherein he now dwelt in Charran*, this is also unsound and appeares to be contrary to the expresse word of God, mentioned by Stephen, who sayth (*Act.* 7. 2, 3.) that *The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and sayd unto him, Come out of thy country & from thy kindred, and come into the Land which I shall shew thee*: The words used of God in that calling, *Gen.* 12. 1. are plainly noted to have bene sayd unto Abram, *before he dwelt in Charran*; and who can then without great presumptiō faine them to be sayd at another time & place, having no warrant of Scripture for the same? I know indeed that (r) some of your Rabbines (who doe so often mislead you) doe write that this call was from *Charran*, but their authority is too light to rest upon it. They will have *Nun*, the last letter of the word (s) *Charran* to be written with the head of it downward and the lowest part of it upward, contrary to the order, to shew (t) that the wrath of God bur-

(q) Annot. on Gen. 12. 1.

(r) R. Solomon Iarchi on Gen. 12. 1.

(s) In Gen. 11. 32.

(t) R. Sol. ibid.

burned untill Abram. One of your authors according to his Cabalisticall art (v) tels us that the numerall letters of the word *arecha* used in the call of Abram, *Gen.* 12. 1. doe yeeld the same number that *begnananim* doth, which signifyeth *by the clouds*, to teach us that the clouds went before him & shewed him the way in his journey. And the inversion of this *Nun haphucah* is as well & as worthy to be observed for matter of meditation & instruction, as are the great & little letters which you (x) mention for like use. You tell us in the same place that *the Hebrew doctours expound the name* Charran *by* Charon aph, *that is*, wrathfull anger, (R. Menachem on Gen. 12.) *as if he were now to depart from the place of wrath, &c.* but if you had alledged the place more plainly & fully, the vanity of that Rabbine would thereby have appeared, while he saith that (y) *whē Abram went to give his influence or abundance unto the higher land, Lot went with him, for that land was to receive from them both: and the word Lot is from Levatin* (which signifyeth curses) *and this at his going from Charan: the word charon signifyeth anger.* This is the vaine conceit contained in the allegation which you send us unto, & compare with so many places of Scripture. And suppose Charan be denominate of anger, yet this will not prove that the calling *Gen.* 12. 1. was from Charan. Againe it appeares to be the opinion of other (z) Rabbines, that this calling of Abram, *Gen.* 12. 1. was from Vr of the Chaldees, before he came to Charan. And besides these, the judgement of learned (a) Christians is herein against you, and more to be respected then the Iewish doctours whom you so much follow. 3. Besides other things, how grosse is that errour, when you write (b) that the *land of Canaan is a country in Asia the lesse, &c.* It appeareth not by the Scriptures that Abram ever came into Asia the lesse. And had he gone thither to seek Canaan, he should never have found that land unto which he was called of God. This your errour of misplacing Canaan is reproved not onely by the generall testimony of the cheefest (c) Geographers, but also by the evidence of the holy Scriptures, which doe oftē & plainly distinguish these countries & make it very manifest that Canaan is not a country in Asia the lesse, as you say. *Act.* 2. 9. *&* 16. 6. *&* 20. 16. 1. *Pet.* 1. 1.

Touching your allegation of *Gen.* 13. 6, 7, 8. we read there of the riches of Abram and Lot, of the strife betwixt their servants, of the Cananites and Perizzites dwelling in the land, of Abrams care to avoyd strife: but how you will conclude your Separation from hence, together with the peoples power in excommunications, who can imagine or comprehend it? we would faine see what face of an argument you can paynt out unto us from this Allegation.

And as for *Exo.* 5. 3. where Moses & Aaron tell Pharaoh, how the God of the Hebrewes met them, how they desire to goe three dayes journey into the wildernes to doe sacrifice, and of the danger of pestilence or sword to come upon them if they did it not; by what consequence will you maintaine your Separation from hence? and by what second consequence will you then demonstrate the peoples authority from this Separation here implyed, as you write? These things doe yet lye hid, wrapt up in darknes, that men cannot discerne what you meane thereby. It is a strange folly in matters of so great controversy, so barely to alledge such a number of Scriptures, which seeme not so much as to looke towards

(v) Baal haturim on Gen. 12. 1.

(x) Annot. on Gen. 23. 2. & 34. 31. & Lev. 1. 1.

(y) R. Menachem on Gen. 12. 4.

(z) Chazkuni com. on Gen. 12. 1. Aben Ezra on Gen. 11. & 12. 1.

(a) Merc. on Gen. 12. Trem. & Iun. annot. ibid. Calv. & Musc. com. ibid.

(b) Annot. on Gen. 12. 5.

(c) Ptol. Geogr. lib. 5. c. 2. Asiæ tab. 1. Strab. Geogr. l. 12. Plin. Hist. nat. l. 5. c. 27 Solin. Polyh. c. 43.

wards the poynt of the queſtion in hand, and this your fault is ſo much the greater in that yon can finde time & leaſure to note and publiſh ſo many other idle and unproffitable things; as when in the explication of this verſe you ſet downe thoſe dotages of *Maimony* about the Peſtilence, *Deber*, which have no weight in them, no ground or colour of trueth. Why did you not rather manifeſt your Separation from hence, if it be here taught as you ſay, for the clearing of your cauſe & plucking others out of the darknes & ſhadow of death, wherein (according to your profeſſion) they do remaine?

CHAP. IIII.

Whether the people be bound to be preſent at the proceedings againſt offendours.

ANother errour concerning the government of the Church is this, that you hold the people bound to be preſent at the conviction of ſinners & triall of cauſes. Though Mr Iohnſon (a) left it free for any of the people to come if they would; yet you (b) hold not that ſufficient, unleſſe they be bound to come & to heare the proceedings. Againſt the liberty of being abſent or preſent you alledge many things, and plead as followeth.

(a) Advertiſ. of Mr Clyfi. p. 41, 42.

(b) Anim. adv p. 42, 43.

H. AINSVV. *Is not this to divide the body, when the head muſt be preſent, & the ſhoulders with the other parts and members may be abſent?* ANSVV. It is no diviſion in the body myſticall, when the head labours for the good of the body, though ſome members thereof be abſent; no more then there is a diviſion or diſunion among the friends that conſult for the comfort of one another, though not preſent; no more then there is betwixt the States of theſe lands & the people thereof, when the States meet apart to determine ſome things without the people; no more then there was a diviſion when the Elders at Ieruſalem met apart without the people. *Act.* 21.18--25.

H. AINSVV. *The Apoſtle writing to the Church of Corinth, how to doe when they* came together *for the Lords ſupper.* 1. *Cor.* 11.18,33. *writeth alſo to them how when they were* gathered together, *they ſhould deliver the wicked unto Satan.* 1. *Cor.* 5. 4, 5. *We finde no difference, but they were bound to come to the one as to the other. And if they anſwer, they are bound to aſſemble for to excommunicate him, but not to heare him by the word convinced in the triall of his cauſe; they may as well teach the people they are bound to come to eat the bread and wine in the Lords ſupper, but not bound to heare the word teaching & preparing them hereunto.* ANSVV. 1. In coming to the Lords ſupper every man is bound unto a ſpeciall & particular examination & preparation of himſelf, & by his owne knowledge to convince & judge himſelf: 1. *Cor.* 11.28,31. but in coming to the excommunication of offendours a man may lawfully content himſelf with the teſtimony of others touching their conviction, and ſo reſt in the judgment of the Church; *Deut.* 19.15,16,17. *& ch.* 17. 8--13. neither doth the Scripture in any place require more of us. 2. A man may be fitted & prepared unto the Lords ſupper, though he doe not heare the word of God taught and preached at the ſame

time when he comes thereunto. True faith & repentance make men worthy & lawfull communicants & able to diſcerne the body of the Lord, though by ſome meanes they be hindred from hearing the Word immediately before. 1. *Cor.* 3.21, 22. *Ioh.* 6.40. And therefore to follow you in your owne compariſon; as a man may lawfully come to the Lords ſupper, though he have not heard the word before: ſo may he lawfully come to the excommunication of a ſinner, and conſent thereunto, though he have not bene preſent at his conviction before, but onely heare it teſtifyed by others. 3. If you finde no difference, but that men are alike bound to come to heare the examination & conviction of offendours, & to come to the Lords ſupper; why doe you not then cenſure thoſe among you that after your Sermon ended doe depart, when you enter upon theſe convictions & diſputations, continuing ſometimes untill eight, nine, or tenne a clock in the night, as well as thoſe that after Sermō ſhould depart & refuſe to eat the Lords ſupper with you? Doth not your owne conſcience and practiſe reprove you in this poynt?

H. AINSVV. *We doe ſo underſtand Gods law, that when it commandeth us any thing, it doth alſo command us to uſe all meanes for the right & holy performance of it: and all will be little enough.* ANSVV. Thus doe we alſo underſtand the Law: but the Queſtion is whether all the meanes for the right and holy performance of this judgement of excommunication cannot be uſed, unleſſe all the members of the Church be preſent at the conviction of the excommunicate. The reader is to conſider whether this be juſtly proved by you.

H. AINSVV. *The people therefore that were bound to ſtone an Idolater in Iſrael, were bound by that Law,* Thou ſhalt not ſlay the innocent, *Exod.* 23.7. *to looke that he were duely convicted of the crime.* ANSVV. But could not the people know that an Idolater were duely convicted, unleſſe they themſelves were all preſent at his examination & conviction? By this kinde of reaſoning, 1. You condemne the juſt & lawfull warre undertaken againſt the enimies of Church & Common-wealth: you might as well ſay that becauſe no ſouldier may ſlay the innocent, therefore every particular ſouldier is bound to be preſent in the aſſembly of the Rulers, where the cauſe of the warre is tryed, and there to heare the examinations & convictions of the wrong-doers. But how was this poſſible in Iſrael, where ſo many hundred thouſands were ſometimes aſſembled together unto the warre? 2. *Chron.* 13.2,3. *&c.* or how ſhould it now poſſibly be obſerved in our times? how ſhould private ſouldiers with good conſcience goe into the field, unleſſe they may reſt in the teſtimony of their Governours touching the cauſe of the warre? 2. By that commandement, *Thou ſhalt not ſlay the innocent, Exod.* 23.7. thoſe alſo are condemned that ſuffer the innocent to be ſlaine, having authority & power in their hands to hinder the ſame: & thus according to your reaſoning, the King or other ſupreme Magiſtrates of any country, that ſhould ſuffer any perſon to be ſlaine or puniſhed within their dominions, ſhould be bound to be preſent at their examination & conviction in like manner, contrary to the liberty that God hath given unto Princes, in appointing & ſending Governours for the puniſhment of evill doers. 1. *Pet.* 2.13,14. And divers other the like unreaſonable conſequences would follow upon this manner of arguing.

H.

H. AINSVV. *And now by this law,* Be not partaker of other mens ſinnes: Keep thy ſelfe pure, 1. *Tim.* 5.22. *every ſoule that is bound to caſt out a man condemned for hereſy or other ſinne, is alſo bound to ſee him convicted, leſt Diotrephes cauſe to caſt out faithfull brethren.* 3. *Ioh.* 9,10. ANSVV. I. The errour of this collection applyed to the Queſtion in hand, appeareth by your owne practiſe; when thoſe members of your Church who having bene ſick or abſent while any perſon is condemned for hereſy or other ſinne, doe yet upon the teſtimony of the Church reject him as an excommunicate and caſt him out of their ſociety. Here you allow a rejection of offendours by ſuch as have not bene preſent to ſee their conviction. II. Your errour in this allegation may likewiſe appeare in this, that thoſe who are excommunicate by one true Church are alſo to be rejected by other true Churches that have not bene preſent to ſee the conviction of ſuch perſons. *Luk.* 10.16. *Matt.* 18.18. *Ioh.* 20.23. 1. *Cor.* 5. 3. 2. *Cor.* 2.10. This ſhewes that a man may keep himſelfe pure, reſting in the teſtimony of others: and that the place, 1. *Tim.* 5.22. is not to be applyed againſt them that doe upon the witneſſe of a Church reject offendours. III. As for *Diotrephes* cauſing to caſt out faithfull brethrē, 1. There is no appearance in the text alledged, 3. *Ioh.* 9,10. that this was done for want of the peoples preſence: his love of preheminence & his tyranny might be exerciſed in their preſence, as well as in their abſence. 2. The reader is here to mark the contradiction of *H. Barrow* unto you, and his further errour who will not have this caſting out of the faithful by *Diotrephes*, to be underſtood of excommunication, (c) *nor to be meant of the abuſe of any cenſure of the Church, &c.* 3. For raſh excommunications & actuall caſting out of brethren, name any true Church where ever this ſinne hath prevayled ſo notoriouſly as among yourſelves and the Anabaptiſts, where the popular order hath bene moſt in uſe. If you looke upon all the Reformed Churches & their practiſe, where the people are not bound to be preſent at the conviction and examination of offendours, I thinke your owne heart will tell you & your mouth will acknowledge, that the like raſh & unjuſt excommunications have not bene executed among them, as among yourſelves & other Sects of Separatiſts that uſe the ſame manner of proceeding which you doe.

(c) H. Barr. Refut. of Giff. p. 165.

H. AINSVV. *He that ſtands out to excommunication, will commonly plead his cauſe to be juſt, and complaine that the Elders have perverted judgment: with what comfort of heart can the people now excommunicate him, if they have not heard the proceedings againſt him, and yet muſt execute the Elders ſentence upon him? Let wiſe men judge whether this be not ſpirituall tyranny, which the Elders would bring upon the conſciences of the Church.* ANSVV. I. They which conſent to the excommunication of a perſon judged by the Church, and doe thereupon reject his fellowſhip; may have the ſame comfort of heart, which your people ordinarily have when themſelves upon divers occaſions being preſent neither at the conviction of offendours, nor at the pronunciation of ſentence againſt them, doe yet reſt in the teſtimony & ſentence of others; and thereupon avoyd ſuch an excommunicate, though he plead his cauſe to be juſt & complaine that the Elders & others of the people have perverted judgement. II. They may have the ſame comfort of heart, which divers of your people have, being ſouldiers here in the ſervice of the City, who together with the reſt of the ſouldiers

doe at the Magistrates appointment attend upon the execution of justice of diverse malefactours, as pyrates & others; and though they have not heard the proceedings against them, though they have not bene present at the examination and conviction of such persons, doe yet help to execute the Magistrates sentence upon them, being ready to assist & defend the executioner, if need should require; even then when the condemned persons doe stil plead that they are innocent, and complaine that the Magistrates have perverted judgement against them. Thus you may see how this your kinde of reasoning brings blood upon the head of your people, and so upon your owne & your Churches head for retaining of them. III. They may have the same comfort of heart, which the Israelites had in avoyding the Lepers, & putting them out of the campe upon the testimony of the Priests, *Num.*5.2,3. *Levit.*13.2--46. though they had not bene present at the proceedings, nor come together to see the markes & tokens of the leprosy; and this even then when the Lepers did plead that they were cleane, & complained that the Priests had done them wrong. IV. The manner of proceeding against offendours, both in the Reformed Churches & in our particular Congregation, is such that any of the people may sufficiently informe themselves both touching the matter of fact & right in any question & cause, before the sentence of excommunication be pronounced: They have liberty & opportunity to deale with the parties accused, and with the Elders also; and this not onely with either of these apart, but also if they will, to heare the conviction of the offendours before the Elders. Yea the cause of such offendours is so often publickly propounded to the whole Congregation, and the people are so often exhorted & stirred up to admonish & deale with those which are run into scandall, that they may fully discerne the guiltines of such persons before they be cast out; and therefore cannot by wise men be judged to be under any spirituall tyranny for consenting unto the rejection of those, whose iniquity & obstinacy they may so plainly understand. V. If the law of God may be expounded according to those select interpretations of the Rabbines, which you make speciall choyse of & commend unto our consideratiõ above others; then are the people to execute the judgemẽts of the Elders, though the proceedings therein be kept in farre greater secrecy then we require. for expounding those words, *Thou shalt not walke a talebearer*, you say thereupon, (d) *As this Law immediately followeth the former about the Iudges; so the Hebrewes apply this precept unto them, saying, It is unlawfull for any of the Iudges, when he goeth out from the judgment hall, to say, I am he that doth acquit or condemne; and my fellowes are against me: but what can I doe, seing they are moe then I. And if he thus speak, he is within the compasse of this,* HE THAT WALKETH *as A* TALEBEARER, REVEALETH SECRETS: (*Proverb.*11.13.) *Maimony* in *Sanhedrin, ch.*22. *sect.*7. *Whereto the Greek version of that place agreeth; A double tongued man revealeth counsels (or secrets) in the Synedrion (or Councill.) And so in Prov.*20.19. To practise according to this exposition of the Jewes which without any note of dislike you publish unto us, might justly be called a spirituall Tyranny, when even the Judges should not be allowed to testify openly against the oppressions & blood & other iniquities maintained by wicked men. Such smothering of sinne is both against the law of God, *Exod.* 20. 16.

(d) Annot. on Levit. 19.16.

Pro.

*Prov.*14.25. *Eph.*5.11. *Esa.*59.4. *Ier.*9.3. *Mic.*7.3,4. and against the law of nature it self, which taught even the wicked Pilate to take water and wash his hands before the multitude, & to make publick protestation of his innocency against them that were authours of unrighteous judgement. *Matt.*27.24. *Ioh.*18.38. & 19.4. Thus doe your writings lead men into contrary extremities.

THus farre for answer unto your owne reasons: An argument on the contrary side brought to shew the freedome of the people in coming or not coming to heare the examinations & convictions going before the censure, and to shew that the people are not bound thereunto, is thus set downe, becaus (e) *So it shall not be enough, that the Elders by their Office are bound unto it, & ought to have maintenance for the doing of it & of the other dueties of their Office: but the men must (without any allowance for it) leave their trades & callings, the women their houses & families, the children their schooling and employment, the servants their work and labour and must come together (though it should be day after day) to heare & judge the cases that fall out between brother & brother according to Matt.*18.17. *for by this Scripture in* 1.Cor. 12.*ch. they will have it understood of men, women, & children that can sorrow & rejoyce with others, as before was shewed.* In your answer hereunto by a crooked winding you turne away from the argument, and doe not direct your answer unto the poynt & force thereof, when as you say, (f) *Let them then excommunicate alone, as well as try the case alone: seing they have maintenance for both; & let the people be bound to come to neither: no nor to the Pastours ministring of the Word and Sacraments (if this reason be good,) because he is more worthy maintenance then the ruling Elders, as the Apostle sheweth.* 1.*Tim.* 5.17,18. For if the Elders were onely bound to utter and pronounce a sentence of excommunication, when the people are gathered to heare the same; then should the Elders deserve no more maintenance then the people. If the Pastour were not bound to study all the week & to take paines to prepare himself for the ministery of the word and Sacraments, but did onely speak the same without labour going before; then could not the double honour & maintenance mentioned, 1.*Tim.*5, be due unto him. Where there is no speciall work, there is no speciall maintenance. And therefore while you doe not require double labour of the Elders in trying cases, but doe binde the people even to the same labour of enquiring, examining & trying matters, how can you require double honour & such speciall maintenance for them? But after this generall evasion, you proceed unto some more particular answers, & say there in your Animadversion:

H. AINSVV. *First, they restrain things too much, when they say* between brother & brother: *for what if it be a publick case of heresy or idolatry, as that mentioned Deut.* 13.12, 13,14. *&c. will they say* women, children & servants *were then, or are now bound to leave their callings, & come together to try out the matter?* Hereunto I reply. 1. They restrain things no otherwise then Christ himself doth, when speaking generally of the sundry sorts of sinne, he also notes them to be *between brother & brother*, saying, *If thy brother sinne against thee. Matt.*18.15. Even to publick sinnes of heresy and idolatry, as that in *Deut.*13. though immediately they are committed against God; yet as they are scandals and occasions of falling unto others, so are they cases between man & man, brother & brother, to be censured & judged by them. *Deut.*7.4. &

(e) R. Cyf. Advertism. p.42. Rom.12.7, 8. 1.Thes.5. 12,13. 1.Tim.5. 17,18. As may cõe to passe in great Congregations and when many cases are to be heard, &c.

(f) Anim-adv.p.43.

4.& 13.5,6,13. II. If they restrain things too much, then doe they no wrong unto you but unto themselves: then is there more force in the matter, then their words doe make shew of. For if it be unmeet to binde all the members of the Church to heare cases dayly between brother & brother even in a stricter sense, as you would have their words to sound; how much more inconvenient shall it be, when by a larger bond they shal be required to heare all cases of sinne, both betweē brother & brother, & between the Lord and our brethren? III. What sense or reason have you to make this question, *Will they say &c.* whereas it is not they, but you which say & plead by all this your arguing, that women, children & servants are bound to leave their callings & come together to try out these controversies?

H. AINSVV. *Secondly, many controversies between neighbours, are for civill things of this life: such are* (g) *not Church matters, nor there to be heard, but by* (h) *Magistrates, or arbiters chosen.* 1. Cor. 6.4,5. REPL. 1. Even the controversies about Civill things of this life, are Church-matters & there to be judged, seing all sinnes are there to be judged. *Matt.* 18.15--17. 1. Cor. 5.11. 2. Cor. 10.4,5,6. If you could prove that men did never make false & deceitfull bargaines, nor use false weights, nor any kinde of extortion, oppression, coosenage, &c. then might you exclude controversies for Civill things from the judgement of the Church. And the controversies about these things being prosequuted before the Church cannot but require a greater time for the examination of them, then the callings & workes of men, women, children & servants can well afford: so that the force of the argument by this exception is not diminished, but further manifested hereby. II. For one & the same sinne God hath appointed two judgements, one Civill, another Ecclesiasticall: as for example, if a man should refuse to divide the inheritance with his brother; this man by the Magistrates might be forced thereunto; and this judgement is a Civill administration. And this is that which our Saviour remooves from himself, *Luk.* 12.13,14. Againe, the same man for his deceit, covetousnes & sinfull oppression of his brother used in this controversy for Civill things of this life, might justly be censured by the Church & excluded from the same; which is an Eccleſiasticall judgement and administration. You cannot shew any place of Scripture, that denyes this judgement unto the Church. Moreover our Saviour at that time was none of the ordinary Iudges, no not in Eccleſiasticall causes. He did not in his life time erect another judicatory besides that which was already thē estabſished among the Iewes: and therefore did not use to excommunicate any or cast them out of the Synagogue. And if Christ did not now ordinarily give sentence, neither in Civill nor Eccleſiasticall judgements, how farre is this his example from proving that controversies for Civill things are to be remooved from the Church? III. As for *Rom.* 13. shewing that controversies for Civill things are to be judged by Magistrates, this is not contrary to any thing in the argument, neither doth it weaken the same. The causes of Murder, Adultery, Theft, Coosenage, Slander, as they are to be judged by the Magistrate, so by the Church also. And if all the members thereof, men, women, children & servants be bound unto the labour of trying and examining such causes, why have they not maintenance for the same, as well as either Magistrates or Eccleſiasticall Elders? IV. As

for

(g) Luk. 12. 14.
(h) Rom. 13.

for matters referred unto Arbiters, seeing they are oftentimes matters of sinne, of wrong & injury (1. *Cor.* 6. 7, 8.) subject in that respect unto Ecclesiasticall censures; this course of deciding controversies doth as wel serve for the ease & help of the Elders, & saves them a labour as well as the people. And therefore the consideration hereof doth help to shew that there is still no reason why Elders should have speciall maintenance, when their ease & excuse from labouring is as much as any others.

H. AINSVV. *Thirdly, for doubtfull cases Ecclesiasticall, people are to inquire the law at the Priests mouth, and to ask counsell of their Elders, severally or joyntly, who are to have their meetings apart for such & other like ends: Act.* 21. 18. *so many things may be composed without trouble of the Church.* REPL. I. The people are to ask counsell of one another also, as well as of their Elders, for in the multitude of counsellers is health; *Prov.* 11. 14. and all the brethren are to instruct, guide and support one another: *Rom.* 2. 17--20. & 15. 14. *Heb.* 3. 13. and by your owne confession they are to be used not onely in private, but in (k) publick consultations also. Yea beside this, you acknowledge further, that (l) the greatest Errours, Heresies, Schismes & evils have both arisen & bene continued by the Elders; that sometimes they are blinde guides and without understanding: and oftentimes they differ in counsell among themselves; and thus in doubtfull cases men become more doubtfull by their counsell, and so have the more need to consult among themselves. If therefore this duety of giving counsell doe lye upon the people and they be bound unto it; this work alone being common to others with the Elders, could not shew the double honour & maintenance due unto them, unlesse some other study and work together with the labour of hearing, examining and judging of causes did require the same. II. As for *Mal.* 2. 7. the knowledge in the Priests lips there spoken of, was that which he principally manifested in his office of publick preaching the law of God: *Deut.* 33. 10. *Lev.* 10. 11. in which office the Elders doe not succeed them, and so have no speciall maintenance due in that regard. Againe, the knowledge in the Priests lips appeared secondarily in judiciall causes, which they heard, examined & judged. *Deut.* 17. 8, 9--12. 2. *Chron.* 19. 8. *Zech.* 3. 7. This power you give unto the people now as well as unto the Elders, who therefore by your doctrine deserve no more maintenance for the same then doe the people in this regard. III. Though we grant that Elders are to have their ordinary meetings apart for the Church-affaires, yet doth not your allegation from *Act.* 21. 18. prove the same. for that meeting being upon extraordinary occasion, to entertaine the Apostle Paul and those that were with him, who being new come to Ierusalem, they came together to salute & embrace one another, to heare tidings of the successe of the Gospel & to rejoyce together in the Lord, *vers.* 19. and then consulted further of such things as tended to the edification of the Church, *vers.* 20. *&c.* You might as well conclude that strangers of other Congregations should be present in the ordinary assembly of the Elders, because we doe here read of some such who being in Pauls company were now also present at this speciall meeting of the Elders in Ierusalem. *Act.* 21. 15, 16, 17, 18.

(i) Mal. 2. 7

(k) Anim. adv. p. 40.

(l) Ibid. p. 39, 41.

H. AINSVV. *Fourthly, when apparant sinners so convicted by witnesses, are to be judged*

ged by the Church: there is no time more fit then the Sabbath day; wherein all men are bound to leave their owne works, (*Exo.*20.10.) *& tend to the Lords, of which sort this is.* REPL. 1. Though I doe not hold it simply unlawfull to judge causes on the Sabbath day, yet that this day is the fitteſt, your allegation from *Exod.* 20. ſhewes it not. Men may then leave their owne works & tend to the Lords, though they heare no controverſies pleaded: yea much more fitly, comfortably and fruitfully may they attend upon the publick adminiſtration of the Word, Prayer & Sacraments, and ſanctify themſelves thereunto in private both by dueties of preparatiõ before, and by dueties of meditation, repetition, conference, &c. afterward, if the mindes of Miniſter & people be not diſtracted or hindred by other controverſies and contentions. *Pſal.*26.6. *Matt.* 5.8. *Exo.*19.10. *&* 30.18--21. *Act.*17.11. *Pſal.* 119. 11. *&c.* That there hath bene ſuch a diſturbance and hindrance among you, it is teſtifyed not onely by ſtrangers which ſometimes hearing you doe complaine hereof, but alſo by your owne Miniſters, as Mr Iohnſon & Mr Clyſton, and your owne people, both ſuch as have left you and even ſuch as ſtill remaine with you. 11. As Eccleſiaſticall judgements are the Lords works, ſo are Civill judgements alſo, which the Magiſtrates ſitting on the Lords throne in ſtead of the Lord their God, doe adminiſter & execute in his name. 2. *Chron.* 19.6. *&* 9.8. And by this reaſoning you might make the Sabbath to be the fitteſt day for them alſo.

H. AINSVV. *Or if that day ſuffice not, they may take any other for them convenient: for &c.* REPL. You doe hereby yeeld unto us that you have walked in an uncleane way, and that you have (according to your owne doctrine) an uncleane and polluted people. for ſeeing as Mr Iohnſon confeſſeth & witneſſeth, (m) *your wonted manner hath bene to heare matters on the week day; at which time there was ſeldome half the Church together:* if now according to (n) your former arguing from 1. *Tim.* 5. 22. men cannot keep themſelves pure from partaking with other mens ſinnes, unleſſe they ſee & heare the conviction of thoſe whom they doe reject, then hath half your Church together bene defiled many times, while they have conſented to the excommunication of ſuch, at the hearing and examination of whoſe cauſe they have not bene preſent.

(m) Treat. on Matt. 18. p. 17.

(n) Anim. adv. p. 42.

H. AINSVV. *For unto publick affaires the Church is to be aſſembled.* 1. *Cor.*5.4. *Act.* 14.27. *&* 15.4, 30. *&* 21.18--22. REPL. This your generall and indefinite ſpeech doth admit many exceptions: for 1. Even the Elders when they have their meetings apart, as you grant unto them, doe conſider together of the publick affaires; and there you ſee then that the Church is not alwayes to be aſſembled unto publick buſines. 11. If the whole Church and all the members thereof, men, women, children and ſervants muſt aſſemble to heare the proceedings againſt them whom they are to avoyd & reject, according to your plea; and this alſo on the week dayes though it ſhould be day after day, as may come to paſſe in great Congregations and when many caſes are to be heard, &c. as was (o) before objected unto you: what reaſon is there that the Elders ſhould have ſpeciall maintenance in reſpect of this work, where all the members of the Church are bound to attend upon the work as well as they? To this you ſay nothing. 111. Even unto the publick adminiſtration of the word and prayer, you doe not binde

(o) R Clyſt. Advert. p. 42.

your

your people on the week day, but leave it free for them to come or not to come unto the same: And shall the hearing of examinations & proceedings against particular men have more honour then the word preached? Yea which is much more, by this your opinion and reasoning you doe more binde your people to be present at controversies even on the week day, then to heare the word and prayer even on the Lords day: for to be absent from judiciall proceedings on the week day doth not onely require acknowledgment of a fault, as doth the absence from publick worship on the Lords day, but by your doctrin it doth also require a reversing & repeating of the proceedings, or else a refusall to allow the same in not rebuking or rejecting them who are publickly censured, rebuked or excommunicated by the Church. IV. As in respect of the ease & commodity of the Church, the hearing of some publick affaires is to be committed to the Eldership, as hath bene shewed before; so also for the avoyding of scandall & offence. for example: the examination of each particular act and circumstance serving for the conviction of offendours in some uncleane & filthy sinnes, and the open repetition & naming hereof before the whole Congregation, men & women, young & old, your owne people & strangers that come to heare, cannot but be very offensive, & so is found to be: for *it is a shame even to speak of the things which are done of many in secret. Eph.* 5. 12. And even shame it self (as it seemes) hath forced you sometimes to leave this your practise, which you so earnestly plead for: As heretofore in the case of H. C. it is testifyed, that in the examination of an uncleane fact imputed unto him, there were certaine men deputed to heare and examine the cause apart from the Congregation, that the eares of women and children and of the whole multitude should not be offended therewith. And why may you not now still by the like reason yeeld that the hearing and examining of offendours may be done apart by the Elders which are the Churches deputies thereunto, as well as heretofore by some other deputies new chosen?

Touching the Scriptures alledged by you, although that which is sayd already might serve for answer thereunto, yet this in particular may be further considered. As for 1. *Cor.* 5. 4. there is not a word of the Churches meeting together to examine the fact of the incestuous person, but onely of giving sentence after it was sufficiently knowne. In *Act.* 14. 27. we read that the Church was gathered together; and so with us both on the Lords day and on one of the week dayes there is a gathering of the Church together. What an idle thing is it to prove that there should be publick assemblies of the Church, which none denyes? But this place shewes not that the Church was gathered together to the publick examination of scandals & to heare the proceedings against offendours, according to the question in hand. As for *Act.* 15. 4. the *receiving by the Church* there mentioned doth not so much as shew that the Church was then gathered together. The Church might be sayd to receive Paul & Barnabas & some others with them, and to heare what things God had done by them, though not in a publick assembly met together for that end: even as the Church of Rome might be sayd to receive Phœbe (*Rom.* 16. 2.) though not in a publick assembly; & Gaius might be sayd to be the host of the whole Church (*Rom.* 16. 23.) & consequently to receive the same, though

not gathered together at one time. In *Act.* 15.30. Luke shewes that the Epistle of the Apostles was delivered to the multitude assembled at Antiochia. So we read that the Epistle written to the Colossians was to be read in the Church of the Laodiceans: *Colos.* 4. 16. So the letters and decrees of Princes & States at this day are often times upon sundry occasions delivered and openly read to the multitude & people in severall cities assembled and called together to heare the same, even as these decrees of the Apostles and Elders were delivered in sundry places: *Act.* 16.4. But doe these manner of assemblies prove that no cases of controversy, scandall or sinne may be examined & heard by the Rulers & Governours without the presence of the people gathered together in such an assembly, according to the question betwixt us? How can such kinde of collections be ever justifyed by you?

That place, *Act.* 21.18--22. is oft alledged by you to shew the peoples power, while it is there sayd, that *the multitude must needes come together*; touchiug which words, though neither the Syriack nor the Arabick versions of the New Testament have them; though the want of these words from the text in this place is by (p) some learned men judged not to be unmeet; yet will I not insist thereon. But 1. to take the words as they are in the Greek, the word (q) translated *must needes*, doth not alwayes signify a duety to be done, but sometimes onely a necessity of a thing comming to passe & done by men, though they ought not to doe it: and so this very word is elswhere used by the Apostle, when he saith *there must be heresies*, 1. *Cor.* 11.19. shewing thereby the necessity of an event, but not the duety of any person to doe that thing. Neither doth any thing hinder but that the word here also in *Act.* 21. may be taken in like sense, viz. that the multitude would needs come together, though not bound by duety thereunto. 2. Suppose that this comming together of the multitude was according to duety, yet seing that both the occasion was extraordinary, & that also the forme of their comming together is not specifyed, whether they were to come as hearers onely of Pauls doctrine, or as judges in judiciall manner to examine him; how can you now conclude from hence that all cases of controversy among brethren are ordinarily to be examined by the multitude of the Congregation in a publick assembly?

(p) Iun. Annot. in Arab transl. in Act. 21. 22.

(q) Δεῖ.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

THE SECOND PART,

Touching

The power of Classicall and Synodall Assemblies.

CHAP. I.

The State of the Question, and the importance thereof.

THe summe & substance of the Discipline or Church-government appointed of God & practised in the Reformed Churches, consists chiefly in this; that when as for the removing of private offences private admonition in the first and second degree prevayles not, or when as the offence is publick at first, the matter be then brought unto the judgement of the Eldership; and so that in weightier cases, as receiving of members, excommunication, election & deposition of Ministers, &c. nothing be concluded & executed without the knowledge & approbation of the Church; likewise that in more weighty & difficult cases, as the aforenamed or the like, the advise, help and allowance of the Classis under which they stand, and if need be of the Synod unto which the Classis is subordinate, be sought & rested in: & this in such manner, that if any person, eyther Minister, Elder, or any other, even the least member of the Church doe finde any evill to be maintained, either against faith or manners, either by the Eldership or by the Congregation, it is then lawfull for them for the redresse of such evill, to repaire unto the Classis or Synod, that by their authority & sentence, the offence may be censured & the abuse reformed. As the Eldership of a particular Church consists of Ministers & Elders chosen out of the same, so the Classis consists of many Ministers & Elders sent from many Churches, & assembling together to heare & determine the cases above written.

That the State of the Question may yet more clearly be understood, it is to be remembred that in this combination of Classes and Synods, 1. The authority which they exercise is not absolute, nor their decrees held to be infallible, but to be examined by the word of God, and not to be received further then they doe agree therewith. And therefore also (a) there is liberty of appeale from them, from the Classis to the Synod, and from a Provinciall Synod to a Nationall. II. The authority of Classes & Synods is not Civill, neither have they power to inflict Civill punishments; they (b) judge onely of Ecclesiasticall causes & that in Ecclesiasticall manner, using no other then spirituall censures. III. In the Classicall union & consociation of neighbour Churches, (c) no one Church hath any prerogative or power above another, nor any one Minister or Elder greater authority

(a) Kercke-Ordeninge Synod. Nat. Dordr. art. 31. 36.
(b) Ibid. art. 30.
(c) Ibid. art. 84.

rity then another: but their queſtions are determined by moſt voyces; and they are all mutually & equally ſubject unto one another in the Lord. IV. This government of Churches by Claſſes doth not deprive particular Churches & Congregations of their liberty & power, but ſerves to direct & ſtrengthen them in the right uſe & exerciſe of their power: for example, when a particular Church with their Elders or the greater part of them agree together to chooſe a Miniſter that is offenſive or unfit for them, if the Claſſis upon due conſideration of the matter doe diſanull their election & hinder their proceeding, yet doe they not hereby deprive them of their liberty nor take from them their priviledge of election, foraſmuch as they doe ſtill leave unto them a freedome to chooſe another fit Miniſter; they doe not in this caſe goe about to chooſe for them, or to obtrude upon them another Miniſter againſt their will, but onely exhort them to uſe their power and liberty aright, and to ſhew more care and godly wiſedome in ſeeking out ſuch an one as may be more inoffenſive & fit for the edification of their Church.

Againſt this authority of Claſſes and Synods divers oppoſites have riſen up and have pleaded for a new kinde of Diſcipline, contrary to the order of all Reformed Churches, and contrary to that Reformation which the ancient Non-conformiſts in England have ſo much deſired & laboured for. And yet many of theſe Oppoſites doe in the meane time in generall termes ſeeme to (d) embrace Synods and greatly to approve of the benefit that comes by them. But herein is the poynt of difference, that they doe limit & confine all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction within the bounds of a particular Congregation. Though they acknowledge Synods to be lawfull, expedient and neceſſary; yet this they hold to be onely in regard of counſell & adviſe, for provocation, direction & countenance: but doe not acknowledge them to have any authority to give ſentence for the deciſion of cauſes; they doe not allow Claſſes or Synods to uſe any Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction or cenſure in judging the controverſies that ariſe in particular Congregations. They maintaine that (e) every particular Congregation is independent, not ſtanding under any other Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves.

This oppoſition of Claſſes & Synods is made ſpecially by the (f) Browniſts, and by them have the Miniſters of England bene reproached for the reſpect which they had unto Synods. After them Mr Iacob in his writings often allowing them for counſell, (g) yet denyes the power & authority which we aſſcribe unto them. And in that booke which is intitled *Engliſh Puritaniſme* (h) this their opinion is moſt plainly & peremptorily propounded. And now alſo Mr Davenp. though he (i) allow a combination of particular Churches in Claſſes and Synods, and ſuch a conſociation of them as is betweene equalls, and is *by way of counſaile, or brotherly direction*; yet he ſaith (k) that their authority *is not a prerogative of juriſdiction, but of æſtimation & reverence rather: becauſe Gods ordinance hath limited the former* (viz. juriſdiction) *to particular Churches, as his delegates in their owne matters, & it is not in their power to alienate it from themſelves: But the latter* (viz. eſtimation & reverence) *is due to Claſſes conſiſting of grave, learned, prudent and faithfull men, for their excelent perſonall gifts, in which reſpect their judgment is to be much valued, & receyved with due regard.* But if any doe aſſcribe unto Claſſes a power of juriſdiction over particular Churches, and

(d) Mr Iacob in his Aſteſtation of Church-gov. p. 118. & 178. Churches plea. p. 94.

(e) Churches plea. pref. Mr Dav. Reply. p. 229, &c.

(f) H. Barrow Diſcov. p. 190. 191. Apol. of Brown. pof. 9.

(g) Neceſſ. of Reform. p. 31, 32, 33

(h) Chap. 2. art. 3. 6. &c.

(i) Apolog. Repl. p. 226

(k) Ibid. p. 229.

and that in things which he calls proper unto themſelves, this he ſaith (l) *is to ſubject particular Churches under an undue power*: this he calles *an uſurped power*. Now then behold what this *eſtimation & reverence* is which Mr Dav. allowes to Claſſicall aſſemblies or Synods; viz. not ſo much power as is allowed to any one man, though it were the moſt ignorant and offenſive that is a member of a particular Church. for when a controverſy ariſeth about the election of a Miniſter, the one half of the Congregation giving voyces for him, another half excepting againſt him as unſound in doctrine & unfit for thē; if a whole Claſſicall aſſembly of Miniſters & Elders deputed from all the Churches round about doe alſo except againſt him as unſound and unfit, and with one conſent judge that he ought not to be called, yet for one voyce of that one ignorant perſon, whereby the one part of the Congregation comes to exceed the other in number, is that unworthy one to be received & called. This is that *due regard*, that *eſtimation & value* which Mr Dav. affords unto this Claſſis conſiſting of ſo many *grave, learned, prudent & faithfull men of exceellent perſonall gifts*, while he maintaines that all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is limited to the particular Church: and all the counſell & brotherly direction of the Claſſis muſt be of no authority againſt the reſolution of ſuch a wilfull company, to cenſure their unjuſt proceedings & to ſtay the ſame. So againe (m) he pretendeth Mr Cartwr. his authority, to prove that *other Churches have no power of hindring a faulty election, but by admonition, which power every Chriſtian hath in another, for his good*.

(l) Ibid. p. 230.

(m) Apol. repl. p. 47.

The ſpeciall or onely remedy which the Oppoſites flye unto in ſuch caſes is the help of the Magiſtrate. But hereby the importance of this Queſtion and the danger of deſpiſing Synods may appeare. Though they hold that Chriſt hath not ſubjected any Church or Congregation of his, to any other ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction then unto that which is within it ſelf, &c. yet they hold (n) *that if in the choyſe of Miniſters any particular Church ſhall erre, that none upon the earth but the Civill Magiſtrate hath power to controule or correct the ſame for it, &c.* that in ſuch caſes others are *to leave their ſoules to the immediate judgement of Chriſt and their bodies to the ſword of the Civill Magiſtrate, &c.* But this help & remedy is weak & inſufficient, & that many wayes: for I. The Churches of Chriſt doe ſometimes remaine under heatheniſh Magiſtrates, that either regard not the cauſe of the Church, & refuſe to judge their controverſies, as Paul & Gallio, *Iohn.* 18.31. *Act.* 18.14,15. or els ſeek wholly to root out the ſame. II. The Churches are ſometimes diſperſed & ſojourne in the countries of Popiſh Princes and Magiſtrates, as the Churches which at this day live under the Croſſe in Brabant & Flanders & ſundry other places, where they keep themſelves as ſecret as may be: and what help can they expect from the Magiſtrates which ſeek to expell them out of their territories? III. Other Churches of Chriſt doe abide in ſuch Popiſh countries where though they be tolerated to have their meetings, as in many parts of France, yet it would be in vaine for them to ſeek help of the Popiſh Governours that have dominion in ſome of the places where they have their abode. IV. In theſe Vnited Provinces of the Netherlands, where the Reformed Churches are maintained, yet forasmuch as here is a toleration of many Sects and Religions, and among the reſt of the

(n) Engl. Purit. cap. 2. §. 6. & 3.

the Brownists, the Magistrates doe not use to judge their Ecclesiasticall controversies, & so afford no help unto those Sects in that kinde. When did the Brownists ever seek any help from them to represse their contentions and schismes? v. That or those Churches wich are secretly gathered in England according to the direction & example of Mr Iacob, doe they not altogether want the help of the Civill Magistrate in their controversies? He prescribes this remedy, (o) that *if people in their Church-elections, &c. will presume to be unruly & violent, then the Princes next dwelling Officers of Justice may & ought to make them keep peace & quietnes.* But durst he or his in any of their contentions ever seek that remedy? Lastly, suppose that in every country the Magistrates did seek the wealth of Sion and did use their authority to correct and punish the disorders committed in true Churches, yet would not this remedy be sufficient to humble obstinate offenders, God having appointed other meanes of Spirituall censure as well as Civill punishmēt to work upon the consciences of sinners, of which more is to be spoken hereafter.

(o) Necess. of Reform. p. 28.

The importance of this Question may further appeare unto us, if we consider the manifold & great offences & scandals which many have the rather fallen into through their neglect & contempt of Classes & Synods, and through want of that help which they might have obtained by them. And this is most evident in the practise & course of the Brownists. In that infamous contentiō whē Francis Iohns. the Pastour with his company did excommunicate not onely his brother George Iohnson, a Preacher also, but his owne father likewise, Iohn Iohnson, comming out of England for this purpose, to make peace betwixt his two sonnes: had they used the help of neighbour Churches & permitted them to judge betwixt them, it might have bene a meanes through Gods blessing to have preserved them from such extreme courses. Hereof George Iohnson oft complaineth in his booke: (p) *they will not consent hereunto, they will not be perswaded nor intreated to let the Reformed Churches heare, try, judge & end the controversy between them and us.* And this is not the complaint of G. Iohnson alone, but the Ministers both of the Dutch and French Churches in Amsterdam doe likewise give testimony thereof, being deputed by the Elderships of both those Churches, & that upon the request of the father, to see if they could procure Franc. Ioh. and the Elders of his Church to submit the controversy to their tryall & judgement. This appeares in the Testimony hereof given unto the father Iohn Iohns. by the (q) Ministers of these Churches in writing under their hands. Yea & further the Church of the Separation did so much abhorre to have their causes and affaires submitted unto any censure or judgement out of their owne Church, that in the excommunication of the father, an old man of 70. yeares, that had undertaken so hard a journey (as he confessed) for the reconcilement of his sonnes, & sought such meanes from other Churches to end their strife, this was set downe as one distinct & speciall cause of his excommunication, viz. *for labouring to draw the Church into Antichristian bondage in the the judging the causes thereof.* This appeares in the Copy of his Excommunication delivered unto him & subscribed by (r) two of their Elders in the name of their Church.

(p) Discourse of troubles, &c. p. 74. & p. 38. 39. & 41.

(q) Iohannes a Vinea, Petrus Plancius, Iacobus Arminius, Simon Goulartius.

(r) Daniel Studley, Stansball Mercer.

And since that time, when the Brownists have so often schismed & rent in the midst, as in Mr Iohnson & Mr Ainsworths division whē they separated one from the

the other; when after the death of Mr Ainſworth that company rending againe in the midſt, one half followed Iohn de Cluſe & the other Mr Canne; when after the death of Mr Robinſon, his company alſo rending in peeces they forſooke their old fellowſhip together; when Mr Canne was firſt raſhly elected a Miniſter by the Browniſts, when ſhortly after that election he was cenſured and depoſed from his office by that half that rejected him & renounced communion with him: In all theſe & the like controverſies they wanted help & durſt not ſeek the benefit of Claſſicall Government, nor ſubmit their cauſe unto ſuch an order of tryall and cenſure, leſt they ſhould enthrall themſelves in *Antichriſtian bondage*, as they call it. They that allow not Synods with authority to decide cauſes, doe yet profeſſe that they are to be approved & embraced for counſell & adviſe: but it appeares by theſe & other not unlike paſſages among thoſe that are of the ſame opinion, that they which deny the power of cenſure in Claſſes, doe ſeldome enquire after their counſell.

And although the importance of this controverſy doeth hereby appeare plainly enough, yet doe we not hold the ſame to be ſo great as ſome of our oppoſites doe make it, as if the eſſence of the Church & our owne ſalvation depended hereupon. Mr Canne calls it (ſ) *a matter of faith, appertaining to life & ſalvation.* Mr Iacob ſpeaking of this particular Church, wherein this ſingle, uncompounded policie is maintained, ſaith, (t) *This onely ought to be allowed & beleeved to be a true Church by all Chriſtians*: and againe, (v) *This is the onely true viſible Church of Chriſt having from him the ſpirituall power of order & government in it ſelf ordinarily. The proper Miniſters thereof are the onely true ordinary Miniſters of Chriſt.* He ſaith further, (x) *The true forme indeed of Chriſts viſible & miniſteriall Church is an Inward thing. It is the Power of a ſingle & uncompounded ſpirituall politie.* He denyes the Profeſſion of ſaving faith, to be the eſſentiall forme, and often inculcates that the forme, eſſence, nature & conſtitution of the Church conſiſts in that *power of ſpirituall politie*, before rehearſed. He complaines of them that doe not practiſe according to his rule, ſaying, (y) *Theſe truly ſeeme to deſtroy the conſcience & faith of the people, &c.* And he gives this exhortation, that (z) *All Chriſtians every where ought to frame the viſible Church where they live to this onely true forme, or els to betake themſelves unto ſome Church ſo formed, as they tender their ſpirituall ſafety & comfortable aſſurance in Chriſt.* But we on the contrary ſide, though we hold that Claſſes and Synods are moſt neceſſary and profitable for the well-being of the Church, being alſo preſcribed unto us by divine ordinance, yet doe we not hold that the eſſence & being of the Church doth conſiſt in this, much leſſe in that forme of government commended by them. If a particular Church of God ſhould ſojourne among the Indians or among Hereticks, where it could not obtaine fellowſhip with other Churches out of it ſelf; or if by violence or other unavoydable inconveniencies any Church ſhould be hindred from enjoying this benefit of combination with other Churches in Claſſicall government; yet doe we acknowledge that notwithſtanding this want ſuch a Church might ſtill ſubſiſt & be reputed a true Church. And yet ſo that we hold every Church bound to ſeek this dependency & union with other Churches, as God ſhall give oportunity & meanes, and cannot without ſinne neglect the ſame.

(ſ) Churches plea. p. 77.
(t) Neceſſ. of Reform. p. 5.
(v) Ibid. p. 6.
(x) The divine begin. & inſtit. of Chriſts true viſible Church. pref.
(y) Ibid. pref.
(z) Ibid. A. 4.

See Voet. Deſp. Cauſ. Pap. p. 65 2.

To this place belongs the answer unto two of those Questions which Mr Canne (a) propounds upon another occasion.

(a) Churches plea. p. 33.

I. CAN. *Whither it be* Jure Divino *that Ecclesiasticall Officers of many Churches are necessarily bound to determine by joint authority the cases of many particular Congregations; or whither it be a thing arbitrary & left unto every mans liberty.* ANSVV. That the combination of Churches in Classes & Synods for judging & determining the cases of many particular Churches by joynt authority, is a divine ordinance and appointed *Jure Divino*, is that which I maintaine & labour to prove in this Dispute & in the following Arguments. As it is not a thing arbitrary and left unto every mans liberty, whether he shall joyne himself as a member unto a particular Church, if he have meanes and opportunity to doe it: so it is not a thing arbitrary nor left in the liberty of particular Churches, whether they shall combine themselves into Classes & Synods, for their spirituall government, if they have opportunity. All that neglect to doe it sinne against the communion of Saints, & walke not as becomes the members of the body of Christ. *Rom.* 12. 5. 1. *Cor.* 12. 25. *Eph.* 4. 16.

I. CAN. *Whither all such cases and controversies, as are decided by many Ministers, combined into Classes & Synods; must so stand, as that particular Congregations may not (if they thinke fit) reject the same, and practise otherwise then hath bene there determined by joint authority.* ANSVV. Men are bound to stand unto the judgements of Classes & Synods, so farre as their determinations are found agreeable unto the Word, & no further. *Act.* 4. 19. But if any particular Church reject their sentence & determination being consonant unto the Scripture, then that Church committeth double sinne, once for transgressing against the written word of God, and againe for despising the ordinance of God and contemning the joynt authority of such as are met together in his name. Particular Churches are so to respect and stand unto the determinations of Classicall or Provinciall Synods, even as particular men and members of a Church are bound to stand unto the sentence of that Church where they are members, viz. according to the trueth and will of God, and not otherwise.

CHAP. II.

The first Argument, taken from the words of the Lavv, Deut. 17. 8--12.

THe first Argument is taken from the ordinance of God delivered by Moses of old unto Israel, where the people of God in particular Congregations were taught to bring their hard & difficult controversies as well Ecclesiasticall as Civill unto a superiour Judicatory, unto the Priests the Levites, or unto the Judge in those dayes, according to the quality of the cause, for the deciding thereof. *Deut.* 17. 8--12. This Order was also reestablished in the dayes of Iehoshaphat who placed and settled in Ierusalem an Ecclesiasticall Synedrion or Senate for the mat-

matters of the Lord, over which Amariah was President, & these were to receive the complaints and to judge the causes of their brethren that came up unto them from other cities & places of their habitation; even as there was also a Civill Synedrion for the affaires of the King, over which Zebadiah was President. 2. *Chron.* 19. 8--11. This forme of government is commended unto us of David, as the praise of Ierusalem, when he poynts out distinctly these two kindes of Senates, (a) Ecclesiasticall and Civill, *thrones of judgement* and *thrones of the house of David*, whereunto the Tribes, even the Tribes of the Lord did goe up. *Psa.* 122. 4. 5. As Paul once rejoyced in the spirit to see the order of the Colossians; *Col.* 2. 5. so David considering the beauty of this order declares the same to be one speciall cause of his spirituall gladnes & joy in the Lord witnessed in that Psalme. Hereby it is evident that the Assemblies & Synagogues of Israel were not independent, but stood under an Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves; they had no single uncompounded policie; all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction was not limited unto particular Congregations. Now let us see what our opposites say to this.

(a) See Iun. Annot. on Psal. 122.

I. CAN. (b) *Hee seekes to strengthen the authority of Classes & Synods by the Iewish politie & government: Now the Papists to establish the* Sea of Rome, *use the same argument. And the truth is, if* Mr Paget *intend to dispute this way, they will cary it quite away from him. But I thinke he will hereafter be more considerate, and speake no further of that manner and forme of* Church government: *seeing he knowes, the most learned on our side doe condemne the Papists for it; viz.* (c) *Iunius*, (d) *Calvin*, (e) *Cartwright*, (f) *D. Whitaker, & others.* ANSVV. Mr Ainsworth before him speakes much in like manner to this purpose, he saith, (g) *It is a mayn pillar of Popery, to proportion the Church now, in the outward politie to Israel. The Rhemists would have* (h) the see of Rome in the new law, to be answerable to the chair of Moses. *Cardinall Bellarmine* (i) *maketh his first argument for the Popes judging of controversies, from the* Priest & Judge *that was appointed in the Law, Deut. 17. &c.* And there also he alledgeth three of the same witnesses against arguing from the Iewish policie, which here Mr Canne citeth againe. Mr Davenp. pleads to the same effect, saying, (k) *The Texts which Bellarmine alledgeth for the power of Councills in making lawes, are the same which the Answerer sometimes harpeth upon in this case, but Iunius clearly sheweth that they make nothing to the purpose. The first is Deut 17. &c.* Hereunto I answer:

(b) Churches plea. p. 43, 44.

(c) Anim. adv. contr. 1. l. 3. c. 4.

(d) Inst. l. 4. c 6. sect. 2.

(e) Ag. Whitg. l. 2. p. 614.

(f) Contr. 4. qu. 1.

(g) Anim. adv. p. 15. 16

(h) Rhem. annot. on Mar. 23. 2.

(i) De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 1

(k) Apol. repl. p. 254.

I. Though the Papists argue from the Jewish politie, and from the same places of Scripture alledged by us; yet it is false which Mr Canne here saith, viz. that they *use the same argument*. They argue thence after another manner, make other consequences & draw other conclusions from those places then we doe. Their abuse of those Scriptures doth not hinder us from the right use of them. for then we might be quickly deprived of the whole Scriptures, wrested by many unto their destruction. 2. *Pet.* 3. 16. The (l) Papists alledge *Mat.* 18. 17. as well as *Deut.* 17. to stablish their Romish authority, yet my opposites think it to be no prejudice to themselves that argue in another manner from the same place.

(l) Bellarm. contr. de verbo Dei, l. 3. c 5.

II. More particularly, the Papists argue from *Deut.* 17. to prove that there should be one person supreme judge of Ecclesiasticall causes, as there was one High Priest among the Iewes. This is justly refuted both by (m) D. Rainolds & by

(m) Conf. with Hart c. 6. div. 2. p. 204.

by (n) D. Whitakers, shewing that the judgement given there was not by the High Priest alone, but by a Colledge or Senate of Priests noted in that Text. The Papists argue from *Deut.* 17. to prove an infallibility of judgement in this one Judge, to shew that the Pope cannot erre. These & such like false collections from the Policy of the Jewes are justly reproved by Orthodox Divines. Had I used any such reasonings, then had there bene cause to have complained.

(n) De Pont. Rom. cont. 4. qu. 7. p. 818, 819.

III. Whereas Mr Iohnson used to plead for the power and authority of Elders in the Church, and to maintaine the same from the Civill Policy of the Jewes & from the authority of the Magistrates in Israel; Mr Ainsworth had just cause to dislike the same, and doth (o) justly alledge against him the Testimonies of D. *Whitakers*, *Iunius*, *Cartwright*, & others. It is true which they affirme, *The argument is not good from Civill Government to Ecclesiasticall:* and againe, *The example is altogether unlike, of temporall empire and spirituall ministery: between these there is not, neither ought, neither can a proportion or comparison be rightly made*, viz. in such a confused manner as Mr Iohnson hath done it. But as for me, I never pleaded on that manner, I argue not from the Civill, but from the Ecclesiasticall Policie in Israel, to shew the lawfull government of the Church by Synods. Mr Canne therefore doeth not rightly imitate Mr Ainsw. in the allegation of these Writers.

(o) Anim. adv. p. 16.

IV. If Mr Canne would see who they be that doe in speciall manner offend by reasoning from the Iewish Policie and government, let him looke yet better upon the writings of the Brownists. There he shall finde not onely Mr Iohns. worthily complained of for (p) *wresting a proportion from the Princes of Israel to the Ministers of the Gospell:* for (q) streyning too farre in proportioning the authority and power of Elders in the Church with the authority of the Elders the Magistrates: for (r) *matching the power of the Ministers in Spirituall things with the power of the Magistrate in Civill things, &c.* But there shall he also finde the rest of the Separation, so many as doe allow their Confession & Apology, pleading from the Jewish Policie & government to establish & confirme the authority & power of particular Churches in their administration of spirituall and Ecclesiasticall censures: he shall finde Mr Ainsw. proceeding yet further, not onely to reason from the Jewish politie but from an imagined power of the people in Civill judgements, such a power as was not due unto them by the Law. These errours have I noted & refuted at large in the (s) former part of this Treatise.

(p) Anim. adv. pref.
(q) Ibid. p. 14.
(r) Ibid p. 19.
(s) Pag. 7--13.

V. Whereas these Opposers doe often alledge that (t) *Moses politie is done away & abrogated*; I answer, Though the Ceremonies that were shadowes and figures of things to come, be abrogated; yet the Judiciall Lawes are not wholly boargated, but onely so much as served to establish the Ceremonies, or had a peculiar respect to the condition of the Jewes, & to that land of promise given unto them. Otherwise, that part of Moses Politie which was of common equity, grounded upon principles of reason and nature, & serving for the maintenance of the Morall Law, is perpetuall & not changed. This is shewed at large by Orthodox Divines. Iunius (v) in speciall doth manifest this, both in generall rules and in particular instances, as in the law of making battlements upon the flat rooses of their houses; *Deu.* 22. 8. in the law of not putting to death the childrē for the offence of the fathers;

(t) Anim. adv. pref. & p. 14. 15. &c.
(v) De Politia Mosis. cap. 3. thes. 13. 14. 15. &c.

Deut.

Deut. 24.16. in the law of not admitting one witneſſe; *Deut.* 19. 15. Theſe and the like Judiciall lawes in the Politie of Moſes are not abrogated. This is likewiſe ſhewed by that learned (x) Writer who defending the Government & Diſcipline of the Reformed Churches againſt D. Downam, declares ſuch Judiciall lawes to be *ad perpetuam Eccleſiæ εὐταξίαν*, for the perpetuall good order of the Church. Now our preſent controverſy is neither about Ceremoniall ordinances, nor other Judiciall lawes peculiar to the Jewes, but onely about the liberty of Appeales, from one Eccleſiaſticall judicatory to another, from the judgement of a particular Church unto a Synod Claſſicall, Provinciall, or Nationall. This liberty of appeales being granted, then a dependency of Churches is granted, and then the ſingle uncompounded Policie is not to be urged upon us. That this liberty of appeales dependeth upon common equity & the light of nature, the practiſe of all ages & nations generally witneſſeth unto us.

(x) Gerſom Bucerus, Diſcept. de Gubern. Eccl. p. 51, 52.

It was the light of nature that taught this law of common equity unto Jethro, Moſes his father in law, approved of God himſelf. *Exod.* 18.22--26. for there (as Iunius interprets the ſame) there was a law appointed touching Appeales from ſubalterne or ſubordinate Judges: (y) *That if any matter did either ſeeme obſcure unto them* [the Judges] *that they could not determine it, or did appeare hard unto the parties* [contending] *that they could not reſt therein; then they were to betake themſelves unto ſuperiour Iudges.* And againe in the ſame place, comparing *Deut.* 17. with *Exod.* 18. he writes that according to the ſumme & ſubſtance of that counſell which Jethro gave, and *ex illo fundamento, &c. from that ground Moſes here*, viz. *Deut.* 17. *defineth the manner of the appealing of parties, & of conſultation to be made by inferiour Iudges, when any weighty buſines ſhould be, &c.* Thus doth he expound this law of appealing to a ſuperiour judicatory, either Civill or Eccleſiaſticall, to be among theſe Iudiciall lawes that are perpetuall, ariſing from the ground of common equity. In like manner G. Bucerus ſpeaking of theſe ſame judicatories, inferiour & ſuperiour, & applying that which he had ſpoken before in generall, unto this particular ordinance, ſhewes that (z) *the judicatories of the Church at this day are lawfully framed according to the ſame forme, and that the reaſon is, becauſe it clearly appeares that this order being anciently inſtituted of God & moſt religiouſly obſerved of the Fathers, did belong onely unto the good order of the Church and not unto the pædagogie of the Law, &c.* and therefore was not to be aboliſhed.

(y) Analyſ. Explic. in Deut. c. 17.

(z) Diſſert. de Gubern. Eccl. p. 65.

Againe, it was prophecyed of Chriſt and his kingdome, that *he ſhould deliver the needy when he cryeth; the poore alſo and him that hath no helper*: that *he ſhould redeeme their ſoule from deceit & violence, &c. Pſal.* 72.12,14. But if liberty of Appeales be now taken away by the comming of Chriſt; then in reſpect of Eccleſiaſticall government, confeſſed to be a part of Chriſts kingdome, the yoke of the Law ſhould be more tollerable, ſweet and eaſy in this poynt of appeales, then the yoke of Chriſt: for under the Law the poore being oppreſſed in judgement by unrighteous Iudges in one place, they cryed for help by appealing unto a ſuperiour *Synedrion*, and there found releaſe, and ſo were redeemed from deceit & violence. but now under the Goſpell, if it were as our Oppoſites hold, that all ſpirituall juriſdiction ſhould be limited to a particular Congregation; then might the afflicted & wron-

ged soules cry in vaine & finde no helper, there being no Ecclesiasticall judicatory to releeve them and to redeeme their soule from the deceit and violence of their oppressours.

We read of Cranmer, the holy Martyr, how that when hē was cruelly handled by unrighteous Iudges he sought to comfort himself by his Appeale from them unto *a free Generall Councell*: The forme of his Appeale is exactly set downe by him, and he doeth as it were cry out for it with great vehemency of words, saying, (a) *I desire, the first, the second, & the third time: instantly, more instantly, most instantly, that I may have messengers, if there be any man that will & can give me them. And I make open promise of prosecuting this mine appellation, by the way of disanulling, abuse, &c.* But according to the Tenent of our Opposites it should thus have bene answered unto him by them: *Seek no comfort in such Appeales: under Moses Policy they were lawfull, but now under the New Testament they are unlawfull: There is no Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction out of a particular Church that may give sentence in your cause, &c.* What an unworthy conceit is this, thus to dishonour the New Testament, as if God had shewed more grace and provided more help for afflicted soules under the Law, then under the Gospell?

(a) Ioh. Fox. Acts & Mon. pag. 1709. col. 1 edit. 1610.

This erroneous conceit is so much the more blame-worthy in some of the Brownists, in that when they plead against the usurpation and injustice of Elders, they thē confesse this same thing in effect, saying, (b) *Is it meet that they should be Iudges in their owne cases? In Israel when any complayned of wrong in the Synagogues or Cities, there was an higher Court to controll unruly Elders & to help the oppressed. But now 2 or 3 Elders in a Church, bearing themselves upon their forged authority from Mat. 18. 17, 20. may be lawlesse; and who shall let them in their proceedings?* And for proof of this liberty in Israel they alledge *Deut.* 17.8,9. & 2. *Chron.* 19.8,10. And why then cannot Mr Canne endure that I should alledge the very same Scriptures to a like end? for, is it meet that particular Churches should be Iudges in their owne cases? In Israel if any complayned of wrong against a whole Synagogue, there was an higher Court to controll unruly & disordred Congregations, and to help those that were oppressed by them. And shall now 6 or 7 persons in a Church (for sometimes there be no more, specially in the new erected Churches of Separatists) shall those be lawlesse, bearing themselves upon their forged authority, falsely collected from *Mat.* 18? shall there be no meanes by any Synod or by any superiour Ecclesiasticall judicatory to let them in their proceedings?

(b) H. Ainsw. Animadv. p. 22.

(c) Ibid. p. 24. Againe they confesse, that the (c) *Saints have as much more power and libertie in the Gospel now, then the Iewes had; as the heyr when he is of yeares, hath more then in his childhood; Gal.* 4. 1,2,3. And likewise speaking of the peoples right then under the Law and under the Magistrate, they say it (d) *may be more, but cannot be lesse now under the Gospel, where the Church ministery hath not the power of Magistracie over Gods heritage.* What is then this liberty that the people have? In the offensive controversies arising and continuing in a Church, the people are either doers of wrong or sufferers of wrong, either oppressours or oppressed: is it now the right & liberty of oppressours, that they in their wrong-doing shall be exempted from the judgement of any superiour Church-government to controll them? and for the oppressed, is this

(d) Ibid. p. 28.

their

their ſory inheritance now under the New Teſtament, that they are deprived of this liberty of appealing to any other judicatory out of themſelves, ſo as to ſeek any help thereby? What is this els but to diminiſh and obſcure the grace of the Goſpell, and to ſhorten the hand of the Lord, as if he did not now ſtretch it out as farre, either in mercy for help of the oppreſſed by allowing them the liberty and comfort of appeales, or in judgement for rebuke of oppreſſours, by permitting them to be lawleſſe and ſecure without danger of further cenſure after they had once prevayled by an unrighteous proceeding in a particular Congregation?

D. Whitaker, whom Mr Canne often alledgeth and often perverteth contrary to his meaning, is very pregnant and full in witneſſing this ſame trueth with me, touching the lawfulnes & neceſſity of appeales. He ſayth, (e) *Truely appeales are of Divine and naturall right, and certainly very neceſſary in every ſociety, becauſe of the iniquity or ignorance of many Iudges. Otherwiſe the innocent perſon ſhould be undone, if it were not lawfull to appeale from an unrighteous ſentence: and ſeing many controverſies doe ariſe in cauſes & perſons Eccleſiaſticall, who can deny that the right of Appeales is of neceſſity to be granted?* Thus he avoucheth that the denyall of appeales is againſt common equity, againſt the law of God and the law of nature. *D. Rainolds* alſo (f) agreeth with *D. Whit.* in allowing of appeales in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. As both of them condemne the Appeales unto Rome, ſo both do grant liberty of Appeales unto Synods. Yea and all the Arguments generally both of Greekes and Latines directed againſt the appeales made unto the Pope, doe yet reſerve a liberty of appeale unto Synods. This may be obſerved from *D. Whit.* in his (g) large & ample defence of the Arguments of Nilus the learned Biſhop of Theſſalonica, as he calls him, and in his maintaining of the Arguments of the Latines alſo. And now if theſe appeales be granted, then is the queſtion clearly granted and fully yeelded unto me: then is not all ſpirituall juriſdiction limited to a particular Church; then are not Churches independent; then is there a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall power to judge the controverſies of particular Congregations out of themſelves.

(e) Contr. 4 de Pont. Rom. Qu. 4. c. 2. p. 470.

(f) Conf. with Hart c. 9. div. 2. p. 572. 573.

(g) De Pont. Rom. Qu. 4. p. 4. 6. & 481, &c.

Laſtly, though Mr Canne cannot endure that we ſhould ſeek to ſtrengthen the authority of Synods from the Policie of the Jewes, yet if he would open his eyes, he might ſee (beſide thoſe above noted) others alſo arguing in like manner. The ancient Fathers have often argued from the Judiciall ordinances delivered by Moſes unto Iſrael, yea they have often alledged this very place in ſpeciall, *Deut.* 17. to ſhew thereby the practiſe of Chriſtians in the New Teſtament. *Cyprian* (h) citeth it often. and the like might be obſerved in other writings of the Fathers. Among later Writers, the lights of this age, *Vrſinus* (i) pleadeth from *Deut.* 17. to ſhew the authority of the Church, for the excommunication of obſtinate ſinners. *Mr Cartwright* (k) to ſhew what authority Miniſters and Eccleſiaſticall Governours have now in the New Teſtament for the governing of the Church, argues from the Jewiſh Policie, and from that Eccleſiaſticall *Synedrion* deſcribed 2. *Chron.* 19. 8, 11. which had power to judge the cauſes of particular Synagogues. *Dudley Fenner* ſpeaking of the Preſbytery in generall, as it containes under it both Claſſes and Synods, as well as the Elderſhips of particular Churches, to ſhew the authority and uſe thereof, among other places taken from the Jewiſh Policie, al-

(h) Lib. 1. Epiſt. 8. ad plebem. p. 94 Epiſt. ad Pompon. de virginibus, p. 170. & Epiſt. ad Rogat. p. 192.

(i) Tom. 1. in Expl. Catech p. 295 & Tom. 3. Iudic. de Diſc. Eccl. p. 806. 807.

(k) First Reply to D. Whitg. p. 192.

ged ſoules cry in vaine & finde no helper, there being no Eccleſiaſticall judicatory to releeve them and to redeeme their ſoule from the deceit and violence of their oppreſſours.

We read of Cranmer, the holy Martyr, how that when hé was cruelly handled by unrighteous Iudges he ſought to comfort himſelf by his Appeale from them unto *a free Generall Councell*. The forme of his Appeale is exactly ſet downe by him, and he doeth as it were cry out for it with great vehemency of words, ſaying, (a) *I deſire, the firſt, the ſecond, & the third time: inſtantly, more inſtantly, moſt inſtantly, that I may have meſſengers, if there be any man that will & can give me them. And I make open promiſe of proſecuting this mine appellation, by the way of diſanulling, abuſe, &c.* But according to the Tenent of our Oppoſites it ſhould thus have bene anſwered unto him by them: *Seek no comfort in ſuch Appeales: under Moſes Policy they were lawfull, but now under the New Teſtament they are unlawfull: There is no Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction out of a particular Church that may give ſentence in your cauſe, &c.* What an unworthy conceit is this, thus to diſhonour the New Teſtament, as if God had ſhewed more grace and provided more help for afflicted ſoules under the Law, then under the Goſpell?

(a) Ioh. Fox. Acts & Mon. pag. 1709. col. 1 edit. 1610.

This erroneous conceit is ſo much the more blame-worthy in ſome of the Browniſts, in that when they plead againſt the uſurpation and injuſtice of Elders, they thē confeſſe this ſame thing in effect, ſaying, (b) *Is it meet that they ſhould be Iudges in their owne caſes? In Iſrael when any complayned of wrong in the Synagogues or Cities, there was an higher Court to controll unruly Elders & to help the oppreſſed. But now 2 or 3 Elders in a Church, bearing themſelves upon their forged [illegible]thority from Mat. 18. 17. 20. may be lawleſſe; and who ſhall let them in their proceedings?* And for proof of this liberty in Iſrael they alledge *Deut.* 17.8,9. & 2. *Chron.* 19.8,10. And why then cannot Mr Canne endure that I ſhould alledge the very ſame Scriptures to a like end? for, is it meet that particular Churches ſhould be Iudges in their owne caſes? In Iſrael if any complayned of wrong againſt a whole Synagogue, there was an higher Court to controll unruly & diſordred Congregations, and to help thoſe that were oppreſſed by them. And ſhall now 6 or 7 perſons in a Church (for ſometimes there be no more, ſpecially in the new erected Churches of Separatiſts) ſhall thoſe be lawleſſe, bearing themſelves upon their forged authority, falſely collected from *Mat.* 18? ſhall there be no meanes by any Synod or by any ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall judicatory to let them in their proceedings?

(b) H. Ainſ. Animadv. p. 22.

Againe they confeſſe, that the (c) *Saints have as much more power and libertie in the Goſpel now, then the Iewes had; as the heyr when he is of yeares, hath more then in his childhood; Gal.* 4. 1,2,3. And likewiſe ſpeaking of the peoples right then under the Law and under the Magiſtrate, they ſay it (d) *may be more, but cannot be leſſe now under the Goſpel, where the Church miniſtery hath not the power of Magiſtracie over Gods heritage.* What is then this liberty that the people have? In the offenſive controverſies ariſing and continuing in a Church, the people are either doers of wrong or ſufferers of wrong, either oppreſſours or oppreſſed: is it now the right & liberty of oppreſſours, that they in their wrong-doing ſhall be exempted from the judgement of any ſuperiour Church-government to controll them? and for the oppreſſed, is this

(c) Ibid. p. 24.

(d) Ibid. p. 28.

their

their ſory inheritance now under the New Teſtament, that they are deprived of this liberty of appealing to any other judicatory out of themſelves, ſo as to ſeek any help thereby? What is this els but to diminiſh and obſcure the grace of the Goſpell, and to ſhorten the hand of the Lord, as if he did not now ſtretch it out as farre, either in mercy for help of the oppreſſed by allowing them the liberty and comfort of appeales, or in judgement for rebuke of oppreſſours, by permitting them to be lawleſſe and ſecure without danger of further cenſure after they had once prevayled by an unrighteous proceeding in a particular Congregation?

D. Whitaker, whom Mr Canne often alledgeth and often perverteth contrary to his meaning, is very pregnant and full in witneſſing this ſame trueth with me, touching the lawfulnes & neceſſity of appeales. He ſayth, (e) *Truely appeales are of Divine and naturall right, and certainly very neceſsary in every ſociety, becauſe of the iniquity or ignorance of many Iudges. Otherwiſe the innocent perſon ſhould be undone, if it were not lawfull to appeale from an unrighteous ſentence: and ſeing many controverſies doe ariſe in cauſes & perſons Eccleſiaſticall, who can deny that the right of Appeales is of neceſſity to be granted?* Thus he avoucheth that the denyall of appeales is againſt common equity, againſt the law of God and the law of nature. *D. Rainolds* alſo (f) agreeth with *D. Whit.* in allowing of appeales in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. As both of them condemne the Appeales unto Rome, ſo both do grant liberty of Appeales unto Synods. Yea and all the Arguments generally both of Greekes and Latines directed againſt the appeales made unto the Pope, doe yet reſerve a liberty of appeale unto Synods. This may be obſerved from *D. Whit.* in his (g) large & ample defence of the Arguments of Nilus the learned Biſhop of Theſſalonica, as he calls him, and in his maintaining of the Arguments of the Latines alſo. And now if theſe appeales be granted, then is the queſtion clearly granted and fully yeelded unto me: then is not all ſpirituall juriſdiction limited to a particular Church; then are not Churches independent; then is there a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall power to judge the controverſies of particular Congregations out of themſelves.

(e) Contr. 4 de Pont. Rom. Qu. 4. c. 2. p. 470.

(f) Conf. with Hart. c. 9. div. 2. p. 572. 573.

(g) De Pont. Rom. Qu. 4. p. 476. & 481, &c.

Laſtly, though Mr Canne cannot endure that we ſhould ſeek to ſtrengthen the authority of Synods from the Policie of the Jewes, yet if he would open his eyes, he might ſee (beſide thoſe above noted) others alſo arguing in like manner. The ancient Fathers have often argued from the Judiciall ordinances delivered by Moſes unto Iſrael, yea they have often alledged this very place in ſpeciall, *Deut.* 17. to ſhew thereby the practiſe of Chriſtians in the New Teſtament. *Cyprian* (h) citeth it often. and the like might be obſerved in other writings of the Fathers. Among later Writers, the lights of this age, *Vrſinus* (i) pleadeth from *Deut.* 17. to ſhew the authority of the Church, for the excommunication of obſtinate ſinners. *Mr Cartwright* (k) to ſhew what authority Miniſters and Eccleſiaſticall Governours have now in the New Teſtament for the governing of the Church, argues from the Jewiſh Policie, and from that Eccleſiaſticall *Synedrion* deſcribed 2. *Chron.* 19. 8, 11. which had power to judge the cauſes of particular Synagogues. *Dudley Fenner* ſpeaking of the Preſbytery in generall, as it containes under it both Claſſes and Synods, as well as the Elderſhips of particular Churches, to ſhew the authority and uſe thereof, among other places taken from the Jewiſh Policie, al-

(h) Lib. 1. Epiſt. 8. ad plebem. p. 94 Epiſt. ad Pompon. de virginibus, p. 170. & Epiſt. ad Rogat. p. 192.

(i) Tom. 1. in Expl. Catech. p. 295 & Tom. 3. Iudic. de Diſc. Eccl. p. 806. 807.

(k) First Reply to D. Whitg. p. 192.

(l) S. Theol. lib. 7. c. 7. p. 276. 277. (m) Polit. Eccles. l. 3. c. 8. p. 707. & 709. (n) Cap. 7. with c. 13.

(l) alledgeth this also, *Deut.* 17. 9. *with* 2. *Chron.* 19. 8, 11. *Zepperus* to shew a divine warrant for the government of Churches by Synods, (m) alledgeth these same places of Scripture, *Deut.* 17. 8. 2. *Chron.* 19. 8. Ruardus Acronius in like manner in his treatise (n) *of the Church of God & the government thereof*, to teach how the more weighty controversies were to be brought from Synagogues and from particular Congregations unto greater Assemblies, he alledgeth out of the Judiciall lawes of Moses this speciall place, *Deut.* 17. 8. *&c.*

To omit many other, how is it that Mr Canne doth so much forget the practise of his owne Sect? Is it not their manner frequently to alledge the ordinances of the Jewish Policie, to strengthen and confirme that power of the Church and that order of government that is maintained and practised by them of the Separation? Their Confession and Apology is full of such reasonings. But instead of the rest, consider we at this time the writings of *H. Barrow*, who to prove the duety of the Church (o) alledgeth this place, *Deut.* 17. 8, *&c.* To prove the power of the Church in driving away and keeping out the profane & open unworthy from the table of the Lord, alledgeth at once (p) *the whole book of Deuteronomy*. and if the whole book, then this 17. chap. also that is contained therein. What unreasonable men are these, to eat up and devoure at one mouthfull a whole book of Judiciall lawes, and not to permit another to have a crumme thereof, or to alledge one of those ordinances? To prove that Princes for their transgressions are subject unto censure and judgement, (q) *to be disfranchised out of the Church and to be delivered over unto Satan, as well as any other offendour*, he alledgeth sundry examples, and all out of the Old Testament, all of such Kings as stood under the Jewish Policie. Can they from the Jewish Policie prove them to be subject to the greatest censure, and can they not from the same Law procure them liberry of appeale, when they judge they are oppressed? Is the Policie of Moses in force to binde them, and is it then abrogate when they seek releef by appeale unto a superiour judicatory? This is indeed an injury & a misery to Princes & people, to high and low, to be brought into greater bondage under Christ in the New Testament, then others were under Moses in the Old.

(o) H. Barr. Disc. p. 1. (p) Ibid. p. 17. (q) Ibid. p. 14. & 245.

THese things being duely considered, it may hereby also appeare how vaine that is, which Mr Dav. excepteth concerning appeales, or the bringing of causes unto Classes. Touching that which I had sayd upon another occasion from *Deut.* 17. 8. *with* 1. 12. *&* 2. *Chron.* 19. 8. 9, 10. he excepts as followeth.

(r) Apol. Repl. p. 215

I. DAV. (r) *The pretended reason, &c. will not help him in the cases questioned, unlesse he can prove,* I. *That the Classes are of the same use by Divine institution, for the help of Pastours which have the assistance of their Eldership, whereof that judicatory was for the help of Moses, &c.* ANSVV. I. Observe how Mr Dav. being an Accuser, and an Advocate of accusers, instead of bringing any proof to justify the accusations, calls upon me for proof of that established order of government, so long enjoyed in these countries. II. Seing it appeareth that the order of Ecclesiasticall government prescribed *Deut.* 17. *&* 2. *Chron.* 19. was for the substance of it no part of the Ceremoniall law, but of common and perpetuall equity, and that the power of Classes for the receiving of appeales & judging the causes of particular Churches

was

was included therein; it is thence also manifest that the power & authority exercised by Classes & Synods is therefore of Divine institution for the same use, from the same grounds of holy Scripture. III. What reason had he in describing the use of Classes to mention this onely, that they were *for the help of Pastours*, seing both they & those judicatories, *Deut.* 17. 2. *Chron.* 19. were for the help & benefit of every member of the Synagogues then and the Churches now, as well as for the help of Pastours? IV. What reason had he also in speaking of Pastours now, to adde these words, *which have the assistance of their Eldership*, seing in the Synagogues anciently their Pastours & Teachers had the assistance of an Eldership, and Rulers of the Synagogue, as well as now.

I. DAV. It is to be proved II. *That the causes in question, which he carryed from the Consistory to the Classis, are of the same nature with those causes between blood & blood, between law & commandement, statutes & judgements, which were deferred to the Levites, the Priests, &c.* ANSVV. 1. It is here also to be noted, how instead of disproving that which I sayd, and instead of shewing any dissimilitude of the question brought unto the Classis, from those brought unto the judicatories, *Deut.* 17. 2. *Chron.* 19. he leaves his accusation without proof. II. As for the proof he requires, it is most plaine and evident from the places alledged: for in them it is manifest, that about whatsoever cause there was any strife or contention in Israel, it might be brought unto the judicatories there mentioned. All Ecclesiasticall affaires, *all matters of the Lord*, were to be brought unto the Ecclesiasticall Senate, over which Amariah was President: All Civill affaires, *all matters of the King*, were to be brought unto the Civill judgement, over which Zebadiah was President. 2. *Chron.* 19. 11. And what controversy can there be in any Church or Estate that may not be reduced to one of these? Iunius in his exposition of these places (f) plainely distinguisheth these causes & questions on this manner. Againe, whereas, 2. *Chron.* 19. *vers.* 10. there is expresse and generall mention of any cause *whatsoever*, about which there might be controversy, *between Law & Commandement, Statutes & Iudgements*, I would demand of Mr Dav. what cause can be excepted or exempted from these judicatories? Was there ever any controversy or any contention in any Church, which hath not reference to some *Law or Commandement*? And seeing Mr Dav. himself in these disputes, pretends *the Law and Commandement* against us, doe not these questions therefore, being of such nature, belong unto such judicatories? Seeing judicatories were therefore originally instituted, to take away strife & dissention, as in Civill causes, *Deut.* 1. 12. so also in Ecclesiastical: *Deut.* 17. 2. *Chron.* 19. and withall seeing *the causes in question, &c.* have bene speciall meanes and causes of discord among us; why should not these matters be brought unto these judicatories for tryall and judgement, as well as others? And therefore whether those Scriptures above mentioned, have bene by me misapplyed or not, I leave to the consideration of them that are able to judge.

(f) Anal. Expl. & Annot. on Deut. 17. 8. & 2. Chron. 19. 8, 11.

CHAP. III.

The second Argument, taken from the words of Christ, Matth. 18. 15--20.

THe second Argument is taken from that Rule of Discipline, delivered by Christ unto his Disciples, for the government of his Church in the New Testament, *Mat.*18.15,16,17,18,19,20. From this rule we may reason divers wayes, and chiefly thus: If this Rule of Christ be the same that was prescribed unto Israel of old, and be translated from the Jewes Synagogues unto the Christian Churches; then are not these Churches independent, then are they not single uncompounded policies, then is not all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction limited within the compasse of particular Congregations, then cannot appeales unto superiour judicatories be justly denyed. But the first is true. Therefore the second also.

The Assumption of this Argument is denyed by many kindes of opposites. *H. Barrow* cryes out against it; (a) *Is it likely or possible that our Saviour Christ would fetch his patterne for the Elders of his Church & the execution of these high judgements from that corrupt degenerate* Synedrion *of the Iewes, which by the institution of God was merely Civill, and not ordained for causes Ecclesiasticall, as appeareth Exod.*18. *Num.*11. *Deut.*1. *the Priests bearing the charge & having the deciding of all Ecclesiasticall causes: Num.*18. *Deut.*17. *But this Counsell of theirs was now mixed of the Elders of the people and the Priests, & handled all causes, both Civill & Ecclesiasticall indifferently. Matt.*26.3. *Act.*4.5. *How unjustly and ungodly they deale, may appeare by their handling our Saviour and his Apostles from time to time. Now as their is no likenes to collect these surmises from that place, so is there no one circumstance in that Scripture to lead thereunto.*

(a) Refut. of Giff. p. 76.

(b) Anim. adv. p. 18.

Mr Ainsworth would perswade that (b) *Christs doctrine in Matt.*18.18. *is a new rule which Israel had not*: and thinks it would *be good for men to yeeld unto this perswasion.*

(c) Parall. Cens. Observ. Sect. 8. p. 75.

Mr Smith, that declined unto Anabaptisme, speaking of the order observed in the old Testament, sayth, (c) *The Lord did not then require men to proceed with their brethren in three degrees of admonition, and so to bring them to the acknowledgment of their sinne and repentance; That is the Lords dispensation for the new Testament. But the Lords order for those times was* 1. *reproof for sinne, Lev.*19.17. 2. *The partie reproved was to offer a sacrifice, which if he did he was cleansed from his sinne visible, Levit.*4.23. 3. *If he wilfully refused to hearken, he was to be promoted to the Magistrate, and put to death for his presumption. Numb.*15.30,31. *Deut.*17.12. *This was the Lords oeconomie for those times: when this order was violated, then all communion was defiled; whiles it was observed, all was well in the visible communion. Let any man declare the contrary if he be able.* Thus he challenged all men in the confidence of this opinion, that Christ gave a new rule.

(d) Attest. c. 8. p. 278. 279.

Mr Iacob speaking of this rule, *Mat.*18. sayth, (d) *The Iewish Church-government cannot be here alluded unto; much lesse required to be kept & practised by Christians. Concerning which together with all other Iewish ordinances, the Apostle teacheth and confirmeth unto us that all those* old things are passed away, *and that* all things *(of such nature) under*

der the Goſpell, are made new: 2. *Cor.* 5.17. *and that the ſame things are* ſhaken *and changed, and remaine not now unto us. Heb.* 12.27.

NOw on the contrary to ſhew the trueth of the Aſſumption againſt theſe and the like denyals thereof, and to prove that Chriſt gave no new Rule, but the very ſame for ſubſtance which was given formerly to the Jewes; let us conſider it in the ſeverall parts thereof, & ſo by induction from them demonſtrate that which is affirmed by us. I. In that Rule of Chriſt, *Mat.* 18.15--20. we have deſcribed to us, 1. Three degrees of admonition. 2. A cenſure upon contempt of admonition. 3. A confirmation of that cenſure.

The *firſt degree* of admonition is moſt private, betwixt the perſon admoniſhing and the perſon offending *alone*, *verſ.* 15. This is no new commandement, but taught of old, both generally in the equity of the Law, to love our neighbour as ourſelves, *Lev.* 19.18. and more ſpecially, to ſhew this love by admonition, in the rebuke of ſinne, *Lev.* 19.17. and that with ſecrecy. *Prov.* 11.13. & 25.9. And further, as Chriſt deſcribes the perſon offending by the name of a *brother*, to ſhew in what loving manner this duety was to be performed to him, ſaying, *If thy brother ſinne againſt thee, &c.* ſo had Moſes done before, *Thou ſhalt not hate thy brother in thine heart, &c.* As Chriſt requires not onely a ſimple *telling* of the fault, but a * *convincing* of the offendour: ſo had Moſes taught Iſrael before, * *thoroughly to reprove* or *convince*, and not to ſuffer ſinne upon a brother. *Mat.* 18. 15. *with Lev.* 19. 17. As Chriſt in the ſame place to encourage unto this duety, propounds the *winning* of a brother; ſo the Lord in the old Teſtament, ſhewes how *the fruit of the righteous is a tree of life*, and how the wiſe doe *winne ſoules. Prov.* 11.30. Thus farre it was no new rule.

* ἐλεγχον.

* hocheach tochiaeh.

The *ſecond degree* of admonition was with witneſſes: *If he heare thee not, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witneſſes every word may be eſtabliſhed. Mat.* 18.16. This is expreſſely taken from & grounded upon the Policie of Moſes, who preſcribed the ſame order for Iſrael. *Deut.* 19.15. Hitherto therefore it is the ſame rule.

The *third degree* of admonition was by the Church, being complained unto and told of the offence. *Mat.* 18.17. This admonition was alſo obſerved in Iſrael, whē as the Church, or thoſe Eccleſiaſticall Governours which repreſented the Church, either in Synagogues, or (as occaſion required) in ſuperiour Judicatories, did *teach, informe*, and *admoniſh* offenders, before they gave ſentence of their obſtinacy and preſumption. *Deut.* 17. 9,10,11. 2. *Chron.* 19.10. Herein likewiſe the ſame rule was preſcribed. And the word thus duely ſpoken in his place, or * *on the wheeles* of order, in divers degrees of admonition, that it might runne and prevayle, was *like apples of gold in pictures of ſilver. Prov.* 25.11.

* gnal ophnau.

The *cenſure* which followed upon the contempt of theſe admonidons was Excommunication, or rejection of the obſtinate offender. *Mat.* 18.17. This was no new kinde of cenſure, ſeeing Excommunication was alſo an ancient ordinance, a part of that Eccleſiaſticall Policie under the old Teſtament; yea deſcribed by the ſame phraſe of *cutting off* (*Exod.* 12.19. *Num.* 15.30,31.) which is alſo uſed in the Goſpell of Chriſt. *Gal.* 5.12. As in Iſrael they had a cenſure of *ſeparating from*

the Congregation; *Ezra.* 10.8. so in the new Testament, in an equivalent phrase, the like judgement was signifyed, by denouncing some to be accursed, *anathema*, or separate from the Church of God. *Gal.* 1.9. And even in this text, *Mat.* 18. 17. the censure of excommunication being described by declaring men to be *as Heathens & Publicanes*, there is not onely a manifest allusion and respect unto the estate of the Jewes, but a cōmandement of the same order for avoyding the obstinate, by denying civill communion, of eating & drinking with excommunicates, as they did unto the *Publicanes*; *Mat.* 9.11. *Luk.* 15.2. and both religious & civill communion, both in publick & private, as they did unto the *Heathen*: *Act.* 11.2, 3. *&* 21.28.29. neither could this rule be well understood without knowledge of the present practise of the Jewes in this behalf.

The *confirmation of this censure*, is described in the rule of Christ, by a threefold testimony and promise. 1. That this judgement of the Church given on earth should be ratifyed in heaven, either for binding or loosing, *Mat.* 18.18. And so Moses setting life and death, blessing and cursing, the judgements of God before Israel, calles heaven & earth to record for confirmation, to binde them to reverence those ordinances of God. *Deut.* 30.19. *&* 4.26. 2. As Solomon, under the Law, at the building of the Temple, did by his prayer confirme Israel in hope of having their prayers to ascend from earth to heaven; 1. *King.* 8.30,31,32. so Christ here promiseth that the prayers of those which agreed touching any thing on earth, should be granted in heaven. *vers.* 19. 3. As Iosaphat for the establishment of the Iudaicall Policie, encouraged the Iudges with the promise of Gods presence & assistance; that *the Lord would be with them in the matter of judgement*, that *the Lord would be with the good*: 2. *Chron.* 19.6,11. so here Christ to encourage his servants in the observation of this order promiseth his presence, *to be in the midst of two or three gathered together in his name. vers.* 20.

Thus it appeareth from the enumeration of all the severall parts of this rule, compared with the ordinance of God in the old Testament, that this is no new rule. Though there were many other Ceremoniall and temporary ordinances in the Law, for the purging of sinne and uncleannes: yet so farre as concernes this Rule, *Mat.* 18. there is no new order prescribed herein; here is nothing specifyed which was not taught before.

II. EVen those witnesses, before alledged by Mr Canne, and before him by Mr Ainsw. doe testify the same: they and others, the most excellent servants of God, the starres of the Churches, subscribing unto this trueth, and bearing witnesse with us unto this interpretation of Scripture, and arguing divers wayes for the authority of Classes & Synods from this place, *Mat.* 18. and specially in this respect, that it was no new rule.

Calvine speaking of this rule and of the Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction prescribed therein, sayth plainly, (e) *Christus nihil hic novum instituit, &c. Christ here instituted no new thing; but followed the custome alwayes observed in the ancient Church of his owne nation: whereby he signifyed that the Church could not want the spirituall jurisdiction, which had bene from the beginning, &c.* And this he also applyes unto the jurisdiction exercised in Synods, when he writes, (f) *If it be demanded what the authority of Synods is*

(e) Instit. l.4.c.11.§ 2.&4.

(f) Ibid.c. 9.§ 2.

from

from the Scriptures, there is no clearer promiſe extant then in this ſentence of Chriſt; Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them. Mat. 18. 20.

„ Againe in his expoſition of thoſe words, *Tell the Church*, he ſaith (g) The quæ-
„ ſtion is, what he meanes by the name of the Church. for Paul commands that
„ the inceſtuous Corinthian ſhould be excommunicated, not by any choyſe num-
„ ber but by the whole company of the godly, 1. Cor. 5. 5, 6. and therefore it might
„ ſeeme probable that the judgement is here referred unto all the people. But
„ becauſe there was then no Church which had given the name unto Chriſt, nor
„ ſuch a manner appointed, but that the Lord ſpeakes as of an uſuall and received
„ cuſtome; there is no doubt but that he alludes unto the order of the old Church,
„ even as in other places alſo he applyes his ſpeech unto the knowne cuſtome, &c.
„ So therefore he now had reſpect unto the forme of diſcipline which was recei-
„ ved among the Jewes: becauſe it would have bene abſurd to propound the
„ judgment of a Church which yet was not. Moreover ſeing the power of ex-
„ communication among the Jewes, was now in the Elders which repreſented
„ the perſon of the Church, Chriſt fitly ſayth that thoſe which had offended
„ ſhould then at length be brought publickly to the Church, if either proudly
„ they contemned or ſcurrilouſly rejected private admonitions. We know that
„ from the time that the Jewes returned out of the captivity of Babylon, the cen-
„ ſure of manners and of doctrine was committed to that choſen Councell which
„ they called *Sanhedrin*, and in Greek Συνέδριον. This government was lawfull
„ & approved of God, and this was the bridle to keep in order the froward & un-
tractable. Thus hath he fully expreſſed himſelf, that this commandement of Chriſt, *Mat.* 18. is no new rule, but taken from the Eccleſiaſticall Policie of the Jewes.

(g) Harm. Evang. in Mat. 18. 17.

Beza in like manner confirmeth this interpretation, ſaying, (h) *This power & juriſdiction was in thoſe which are therefore called*, Ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, Rulers of the Synagogue, *Mark.* 5. 22. *& an example of this cuſtome is found*, *Ioh.* 9. 22. *&* 12. 42. *&c.* And ſpeaking of this word *Church*, mentioned *Mat.* 18. (he ſayth,) It
„ is to be obſerved that they doe foulely erre which would prove from this place
„ that all things are to be referred unto the aſſembly of the whole multitude.
„ They ſay the name of Church is never otherwiſe taken: which from this very
„ place is convinced to be falſe. for certainly it appeares that theſe things are ſpo-
„ ken as of the Jewes, at leaſt from this which he addeth, Let him be unto thee as
„ an Heathen and Publicane. But all writers of theſe things doe teſtify that the
„ judgements of theſe matters among the Jewes were in the Elders, and that the
„ whole multitude of the people was not alwayes wont to be aſſembled. And cer-
„ tainly unleſſe Chriſt had applyed his whole ſpeech unto the cuſtome of his
„ times, who could have underſtood what he ſpoke? Afterwards againe in the
ſame place he addeth this, *Sed doceo Ariſtocratiam Chriſtianam non eſſe novum aliquod inſtitutum, &c. I teach that the Chriſtian government of the Church by an Elderſhip is no new inſtitution, &c.* no new rule.

(h) Annot. maj. in N. Teſt. in Mat. 18. 17.

D. Whitaker to prove the authority of Synods, brings warrant & evidence, not

onely from the new Testament, but also (i) from the Church of Israel and from the Ecclesiasticall Policie of the Jewes before Christ, in the times of David, Ezekias, Iosias & other godly Princes, by which it appeares that he held this part of Church-government not to be a new ordinance, but a practise common both to Jewish & to Christian Churches. And besides, from this very place, *Mat.* 18. he drawes a double warrant for Synods: first from the commandement, given to Peter as well as to others, to *tell the Church. vers.* 17. from thence he argueth against the Papists, that the Pope may be judged of a Councell. (k) *If* (saith he) *every particular Church hath greater authority in judgement, then Peter or any particular man; then much more the universall Church, which is represented in a generall Councell or Synod.* Herein he is directly opposite to our opposers, who grant a power of jurisdiction to a particular Church, but none to any Synod whatsoever, further then to counsell and direct. Againe he (l) argueth from the promise of Christ, *Mat.* 18. *Where two or three are met together in my name there am I in the midst of them*, & applyes that sentence to the maintenance & allowance of Synods, particular or generall.

(i) Cont. 3. de Conc. qu. 1. de necess. Concil. c. 3. p. 15.

(k) Ibid. de Concil. qu. 5. c. 3. p. 169. 170.

(l) Ibid. qu. 1. c. 3.

Iunius in like manner, as he is plentifull in giving allowance unto the authority of Synods, so he derives this authority from this place, *Mat.* 18. both from the (m) commandement of *telling the Church*, *vers.* 17. and from the (n) promise made unto Ecclesiasticall assemblies, to be *in the midst of them, vers.* 20. while he allowes that promise alledged by others to be a just ground thereof, though he adde other warrant also. And further, speaking of the Councell or Ecclesiasticall Senate, he shewes what reference it had unto the Politie or government of the Jewish Synagogues; he saith, That which (o) *the Church of the Iewes called the Synagogue, that Christ in like manner called the Church in that place, Mat.* 18. *for as the Synagogue or Ecclesiasticall Counsell was a certaine Epitome of the Church, so also is the Presbytery.*

(m) Anim-adv. in Bellarm. de Concil. l. 2. c. 19. art. 8.

(n) Ibid. in lib. 1. c. 3.

(o) Eccles. ast. l. 2. c. 3.

Mr Cartwright above many other is very pregnant in giving plaine testimony, that this rule of discipline is no new ordinance, and this for that part of the rule in speciall which is most controversall. He disputing about the interpretatiō of *Mat.* 18. saith, (p) It is commanded of our Saviour Christ, that in such a case when a brother doth not profit by these two warnings, it should be told the Church. Now I would aske who be meant by the Church here: if he say by the Church are meant all the people, then I will aske how a mā can conveniently complaine to all the whole congregation, or how can the whole congregatiō conveniently meet to decide of this matter. I doe not deny, but the people have an intereſt in the excommunication, as shall be noted hereafter; but the matter is not so farre come, he must first refuse to obey the admonitiō of the Church, or ever they can proceed so farre. Well, if it be not the people that be meant by the Church, who is it? Thē shewing that by *the Church* one person alone cannot be meant, he concludes; Seeing then that the Church here is neither the whole congregatiō, nor the Pastour alone, it followeth that by the Church here he meaneth the Pastour with the Ancients or Elders. Or else whom can he meane? And as for this manner of speech, wherein by the Church is understanded the cheef governours & Elders of the Church, it is oftentimes used in the old Testamēt, from the which our Saviour borowed this manner of speaking. For instances he alledgeth, *Exo.* 4. 29, 30. *Ios.* 20. 4.

(p) First Reply to D. Whitg. p. 176. edit. 2.

20.4.6. 1. *Chr.* 13.2.4. *&c.* After this he is yet more plaine in reſpect of the cenſure, „ ſaying, (q) Now that this charge of excommunicatiō belongeth not unto one, or „ to the Miniſter, but cheefly to the Elderſhip & Paſtour, it appeareth by that which „ the authors of the Admonitiō alledge out of *S. Matth. c.* 18. 17. which place I have „ proved before to be neceſſarily underſtanded of the Elders of the Church. And further in the ſame place, It may be the clearlyer underſtanded that the Preſby- „ tery or Elderſhip, had the cheef ſtroke in this excommunication, if it be obſer- „ ved that this was the Polity or diſcipline of the Jewes, and of the Synagogue, „ from whence our Saviour Chriſt took this, and tranſlated it unto this Church; „ that when any man had done any thing that they held for a fault, that then the „ ſame was puniſhed & cenſured by the Elders of the Church, according to the „ quality of the fault, as it may appeare in S. Matthew, *ch.* 5.22. *&c.* A little after „ he addes, And if the fault were judged very great, then the ſentence of Excom- „ munication was awarded by the ſame Elders, as appeareth in S. Iohn, *cha.* 9.22. „ And this was the cauſe why our Saviour Chriſt ſpake ſo ſhortly of this matter „ in the 18. of S. Matthew, without noting the circumſtances more at large, for „ that he ſpake of a thing which was well knowne and uſed amongſt the Jewes „ whom he ſpake unto.

(q) Ibid. p. 183.

To the ſame purpoſe he writes in his anſwer to the Rhemiſts, where ſpeaking of the Governours of the Church, which were ſet over every ſeverall aſſembly in „ the time of the Law, he ſaith, (r) Thoſe governing Elders are divers times in „ the ſtory of the Goſpell made mention of under the title of the *Rulers of the Sy-* „ *nagogue.* And this manner of government, becauſe it was to be tranſlated unto „ the Church of Chriſt under the Goſpell, our Saviour by the order (at that pre- „ ſent) uſed amongſt the Jewes, declared what after ſhould be done in his „ Church.

(r) Confut. of Rhem. tranſl. on Mat. 18. 18.

Neither doth he ſpeak theſe things touching the Elderſhips of particular Congregations onely, but applyes the ſame unto Claſſicall & Synodall Preſbyteries alſo, and doth allow of appeales unto them, and thereby acknowledgeth a dependency of Churches mutually one upon another. It is to be obſerved here (ſayth „ he) (ſ) that both in this part of the Diſcipline, *viz. touching excommunication*, and „ alſo in all other parts of it (as I have ſhewed) as in harder and difficulter cauſes, „ things were referred unto the Synods Provinciall, Nationall or Generall, as „ the caſe required: ſo if the Elders of any Church ſhall determine any thing con- „ trary to the word of God, or inconveniently in any matter that falleth into their „ determination, the parties which are greeved may have recourſe for remedy, „ unto the Elders and Paſtours of divers Churches, that is to ſay, unto Synods of „ Shires, or Dioceſes, or Provinces, or Nations, of as great or of as ſmall com- „ paſſe as ſhall be thought convenient by the Church, according to the difficulty „ or weight of the matters, which are in controverſy. Which meetings ought to „ be as often as can be conveniently, not onely for the deciſion of ſuch difficulties „ which the ſeverall Preſbyteries cannot ſo well judge of, but alſo to the end that „ commō counſell might be takē for the beſt remedy of the vices or incommodi- „ ties, which either the Churches be in, or in danger to be in. And as thoſe things

(ſ) First Reply to D. Whitg p. 187.

which

„ which cannot be decided by the Elderſhip of the Churches are to be reſerved „ unto the knowledge of ſome Synod of a Shire or Dioceſe: ſo thoſe which for „ their hardnes cannot be there decided, muſt be brought into the Synodes of „ larger compaſſe, as I ſhave ſhewed to have bene done in the Apoſtles times, and „ in the Churches which followed them long after. And thus it appeares that according to the order and practiſe of the Jewes under the Law, he allowes and maintaines a liberty of appeales for parties greeved, and a ſuperiour judicatory above particular Churches, an uſe of Synods not onely for counſell but for deciſion of controverſies, for cenſuring of offenders even unto excommunication, according to divers inſtances thereof given by him in the precedent pages, of which more is to be ſayd hereafter.

Mr Traverſe agreeth fully with the former, and witneſſeth plainly that the Rule of Chriſt, *Mat.* 18. is no new rule, but taken from the Jewiſh Policie, and this both in reſpect of the perſons judging, called the Church, and in reſpect of the cenſure & ſentence of excommunication there deſcribed. For the firſt, he ſayth, „ ſpeaking of the aſſembly of Elders, (t) In *Mat.* 18. our Saviour calleth them by „ the name of the Church, becauſe they rule and governe Church matters under „ the name and authority of the Church. So likewiſe the name of all the Aſſem- „ bly, by Moſes is given to the Elders of the Jewes; that is to ſay, unto certaine „ choſen & picked out men who were aſſigned by all the Congregation to the go- „ vernment of the affaires. Thus plainly it is taken in *Numb.* 8. where the Lord „ appointeth the Congregation ſhall lay hands upon the Levites: but I think no „ man will ſay this is to be underſtood of all the congregation, that ſo many thou- „ ſands ſhould lay their hands upon them, as are rehearſed then to have bene in the „ hoſt of Iſrael, but the Elders and Princes onely as *Aben Ezra* doth rightly inter- „ pret it. Which is to be noted the rather, becauſe ſome will have the word of „ our Saviour to be expounded of all the Church, whereas according to the man- „ ner of ſpeaking which the Hebrewes uſe, the Conſiſtory or Councell of the „ Church is called the Church: Where alſo it is to be obſerved that together „ with the name, the thing it ſelf is tranſlated from the Jewes unto us: that looke „ what a Councell the Jewes uſed for the government of the Church, we ought „ to underſtand by this name that ſuch a one is appoynted by our Saviour to be u- „ ſed in the Church. Therefore in the ſame place he attributeth to this Coun- „ cell the chief government of all Church matters; that all ſuch things as cannot „ otherwiſe be agreed and ended be at the laſt brought unto them, and ended by „ their authority & judgement.

(t) Eccleſ. Diſcipl. p. 87. edit. 1617.

As for the ſecond, the cenſures of the Church, having ſpoken before of Suſ- penſion and proceeding to ſpeak of Excommunication, he ſaith, (v) This part of „ Eccleſiaſticall cenſure, as alſo the firſt, were tranſlated unto us from the Jewes; „ for the Church of Chriſt in all this matter of Diſcipline hath received all her „ lawes & decrees from the Jewes: for as it hath bene ſhewed before, it is plaine „ & manifeſt that our Saviour in *Mat.* 18. 17. alluded to the manner of the Jewes, „ becauſe that otherwiſe his ſpeech ſhould have bene very obſcure, and ſuch as „ no man had bene able to underſtand. But this appeareth moſt manifeſtly by the

(v) Ibid. p. 92.

ex-

excommunication of the blind man in the 9. of *Iohn*, &c. And further, that which he ſayth concerning the government of a particular Church, he extends alſo unto the (x) Synods for the governing of more Churches, of which there ſhall be more occaſion to ſpeake againe hereafter. (x) Ibid. p. 98.

Mr Fenner in his *Counterpoyſon* touching the certaine forme of Eccleſiaſticall government, declares himſelf to be of the ſame minde, viz. that the Rule of Chriſt, *Mat.* 18. is no new rule, when as he writes, (y) *Our Saviour Chriſt in ſetting downe the Eccleſiaſticall Preſbyterie, ſpeaketh according to the Iewes, for otherwiſe the Apoſtles could not have underſtood him, when he ſayd*, Tell the Congregation, or Church, *which was the title then given unto the Eccleſiaſticall Senate; and his words of having* as a Publicane & Heathen, *doe manifeſtly prove he meant to ſpeak according to their cuſtome*, &c. And therefore alſo in his (z) generall deſcription of a Preſbyterie comprehending under it as well the government of many Churches by Synods, as of one particular Church by the Elderſhip thereof, for the proof and warrant of one as well as the other, he alledgeth this rule, *Mat.* 18. 18. even as he doth other places taken from the Jewiſh Policy under the Law. (y) Part of a Regiſter, p. 479. (z) S. Theol. l. 7. c. 7. p. 276.

Mr Brightman, when he ſhewes that Chriſt in his Church hath appointed a more accurate order for removeall of leſſe offences, then that which the Phariſees obſerved, who corrupted the Law with their erroneous gloſſes, condemning groſſer ſinnes, as murders, and neglecting leſſer tranſgreſſions; yet for the forme of the Judicatorie he declares that it was ſuch an one as the former Writers doe witneſſe to have bene taken from the Jewes Policy, when as he thus deſcribeth it (a) *The Synedrion is a Senate of Elders, watching for the ſoules of that Congregation over which they are ſet in things that belong unto manners & Chriſtian honeſty, which Senate becauſe it repreſents the ſtate* (or * beares the place) *of the whole Congregation, is called of Chriſt himſelf* the Church, *ſaying* Tell the Church, *Mat.* 18. 17. *and of Paul is called* * the Elderſhip, 1. *Tim.* 4. 14. And againe in the next leafe, ſhewing the meaning of that text, *Matth.* 18. 15, &c. *Onely remember thence, that the Church is not the whole Congregation but a Synedrion* or Senate *of certaine choſen perſons.* And for ought that can be gathered from this his expoſition, it was no new rule, but a renewing and confirming of that which had bene of old preſcribed unto Iſrael. (a) Comment. in Cant. cap. 4. * quoniam vicem ſuſtinear &c. * Πρεσβυτέριον.

Mr Parker for the maintenance of Claſſes and Synods whereby many particular Churches are combined & united together, argues alſo from *Mat.* 18. and that after a double manner. for firſt, to ſhew withall that the right manner and forme of combination doth conſiſt in a mutuall obligation of Churches, without ſubjection unto the rule or dominion of any one, he reaſons thus, (b) *Let us goe to the very fountaine of combination, which (as Chamierus ſaith well) is found in Mat.* 18. *becauſe many Churches are combined together after the ſame manner that the prime Churches*, viz. particular Congregations, *doe grow together in their members into one frame. And he maintaines that the forme of this combination & comming together is noted in thoſe words*, in my name, *and* if they agree together. *Mat.* 18. *v.* 19, 20. Thus he derives the combination of Churches from their mutuall conſent & agreement. And hence it may appeare further, that as members of particular Churches are united together by the bond of mutuall conſent, not onely for counſell & adviſe, but alſo for the cen- (b) Polit. Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 22. p. 331.

suring & judging of their offences, and this without superiority of one member above another; so by the like bond of mutuall consent many Churches are also united, not onely for counsell, but for the mutuall censuring & deciding of one anothers causes, and this without superiority of any one Church above the rest. Otherwise also how could he have applyed these things as he doth, for the defence of the Reformed Churches, wherein such authority of Classes and Synods is exercised?

Secondly, whereas D. Whitgift & others dispute against the Classes & Presbyteries of Scotland & the Low-countries, where the faults and causes of particular Churches are judged & censured, and aske for Scripture to prove and justify such an order of government; Mr Parker in defence of them, besides other answers & proofes alledges this place, *Matt.* 18. for the warrant thereof, and sayth, (c) *This proceeding from an Eldership to a Classis, from a Classis to a Synod, is founded in the institution of Christ, Matt.* 18. 17. *by proportion on this manner. He commands that from the admonition of one being despised men proceed unto the admonition of two or three, if that be contemned unto the censure of the Eldership, if that be despised unto the censure of the whole Church: therefore why not from one whole Church unto many in a Classis, & againe from many in a Classis unto yet more in a Synod?* And having layd this just foundation he reprooves the opposites further from the confessiō of some of them contradicting the other, (d) *Both Sutlive & Downam doe interpret* the Church, *Mat.* 18. *to be either a Consistory or a Synod. Behold therefore by the judgement even of Hierarchicall men themselves, a manifest commandement of Christ for Classicall assemblies. for what? Is not the Classis a certaine kinde of Synod?*

(c) Polit. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24. p. 355.

(d) Ibidem.

Zepperus having spoken of the Ecclesiasticall Policie or government in the Judaicall Church, shewes how the same was continued, when he sayth, (e) *This administration of Ecclesiasticall discipline Christ also established and made to be perpetuall, Mat.* 18. 15. *&c.*

(e) Polit. Eccl. l. 1. c. 16. p. 198. 199.

Gerson Bucerus, that excellent and worthy servant of God, who hath given so full an answer to D. Downam, in defence of the Discipline practised in the Reformed Churches, is as full in this poynt, that the Rule of Christ, *Mat.* 18. is no new rule. He maintaineth that (f) the forme of the sacred Politie in the new Testament, ought to be framed according to the manner of the Jewes Politie. To this end he (g) brings the testimony of many learned Writers, witnessing with him unto the same trueth.

(f) Dissert. de Gubern. Eccl. p. 182.

(g) Ibid. p. 48.

Philip Melanchthon, as he is there alledged by him, shewing what order of Discipline was appoynted by Christ, in those words, *Tell the Church, Mat.* 18. sayth, (h) *This custome was not first instituted of the Messias, but was the old manner of the Leviticall Priests, who in their place maintained the discipline by such judgements, though they had also other Politicall judgements & punishments.*

(h) P. Melā. coment. in 1. Cor. 15.

Victorinus Strigelius, cited also by him, speakes in like manner, (i) *A new forme of judgement is not instituted in this place, but the old manner is repeated, delivered from the first fathers, the steps whereof have alwayes remained in the Church. &c.*

(i) Hypom. in N. T. in Mat. 18.

Pezelius having expressed the forme of Government in Israel, writes thus, (k) *According to this example of the old Politie, almost the same order of judgements was kept*

(k) Argum. & Resp. Theol. part. 7. 8. 690.

in

in the new Teſtament. &c.

Muſculus (l), & *Aretius* (m), are likewiſe brought in by him as deriving & deſcribing the Diſcipline of the Church, *Matth.* 18. from the manner of the Jewiſh Synagogue.

Bucanus alſo deſcribing this Diſcipline, ſayth, (n) *Chriſt hath expreſſely appointed this order tranſlated unto us from the Church of Iſrael.* And againe, (o) *Chriſt doth not deſcribe a temporary but a perpetuall order of his Church, Mat.* 18.17. *where following the cuſtome that had bene alwayes obſerved in the ancient Church of the Iewes, he ſignifyed that the Church cannot want that ſpirituall juriſdiction, which had bene from the beginning.*

(l) Loc. cō. de Eccl. c. 7.
(m) Problē. Tom. 2. loc. de Excom.
(n) Loc. cō. loc. 44. de Diſcipl. qu. 12.
(o) Ibid. qu. 22.

And leſt any ſhould blame us, that we ſeeme to be drawne with the judgement and conſent of late Writers, the ſame (p) *Gerſom Bucerus* doth alſo alledge divers of the ancient Writers, as (q) *Ambroſe*, (r) *Theodoret*, (ſ) *Cyrill*, (t) *Gregorius Magnus*, agreeing with us that the Church of the new Teſtament ſucceeding the Church of the Jewes hath borrowed from thence the forme of her Politie, and the order of juriſdiction. And to theſe I might adde many other, but that I have further occaſion to doe it hereafter, in anſwering the objections from the perverted Teſtimonies both of new & old Writers.

(p) Diſſert. de Gub. Eccleſ. p. 49. 50.
(q) In 1. Tim. 5.
(r) In 1. Tim. 4.
(ſ) In Ioan. l. 6. cap. 20.
(t) In Cant. cap. 6.

It is not here to be omitted, that *Mr Iohnſon*, Paſtour of the Separatiſts, who had bene a principall inſtrument in oppugning this interpretation of *Matt.* 18. by whoſe writings many had bene confirmed in their oppoſition againſt us, hath yet before his death, after long experience and conſideration, confeſſed his errour in this poynt, and a in peculiar Treatiſe publickly revoked the ſame. And though in other poynts touching the order of government preſcribed in *Matt.* 18. he came not to the cleare ſight of the trueth, yet thus farre he hath ſhewed his conſent with the former Writers, ſaying, (v) *Note here, that if Chriſt now had given a new Rule of government that Iſrael had not, the Diſciples to whom it was ſpoken, could not have underſtood it by theſe words, which were according to the Iewes received phraſe & practiſe: and the Phariſees & other adverſaries of Chriſt would have bene glad, if they could have had ſuch an exception againſt Chriſt, that he had taught contrary to Moſes, and had led the people from the way & order of government which the Lord himſelf had preſcribed in his word.*

(v) Expoſ. of Mar. 18. 17. C1.

III.

AFter evidence of Scripture & conſent of ſo many Writers agreeing in the interpretation of this place, let us now examine the exceptions of ſuch oppoſites, as maintaine that Chriſt gave a new rule in *Mat.* 18.

Some object with *H. Barrow* the unjuſt & ungodly dealing of the Rulers in that time, and reaſon thus: that it is not likely or poſſible that our Saviour ſhould fetch his patterne from *that corrupt degenerate Synedrion of the Iewes, &c.* To theſe I anſwer:

1. Though the Governours of the Jewes in Chriſts time were moſt of them wicked men, and abuſed their authority; yet the forme of government it ſelf, and namely ſo much of it & ſo farre as it is deſcribed in that Rule, *Mat.* 18. that there ſhould be a Synedrion or Preſbyterie for the judging of offences in ſuch order as is there ſpecifyed, cannot be ſhewed to be unlawfull, nor contrary to that which God had appoynted of old by Moſes: And therefore our Saviour might well commend the very ſame unto his Diſciples. Thus *Calvine* anſwereth a like ob-

jection, (x) *If any man except that all things were corrupt & perverted in the time of Christ, so as that tyranny could be accounted nothing lesse then the judgement of the Church: the answer is easy, Though there was then an adulterate & perverse manner, yet Christ might worthily commend the order so as it was delivered from the Fathers. And when a little after he erected his Church, the corruption being removed, he restored the pure use of excommunication.*

(x) Harm. Evang. in Mat. 18. 17.

II. How great soever the abuses and corruptions of Governours & Government were in Christs time; yet were not the godly required then to renounce or forsake the communion of that Church. Christ himselfe both by his example & his commandement taught otherwise, whiles he both communicated therewith himself, *Matt.* 26. 17, 18. and likewise required others to doe the same. *Luk.* 17. 14. *Mat.* 8. 4. & 23. 2, 3. Now forasmuch as the publick worship of God and his ministery are holy ordinances, as well as the government of his Church; seeing Christ taught his people to goe unto the worship & ministery of the Jewes either in Synagogue or Temple, what reason is there to think that they should be forbidden to repayre unto their government in their Synedriō or Presbyterie? Moreover as our Saviour taught ordinarily *in the Synagogue and in the Temple, whither the Iewes alwayes resorted*; *Iohn.* 18. 20. *Matt.* 4. 23. so there were some righteous and faythfull men Governours and Rulers of the Jewes in Christs time, who though they consented not unto evill and unrighteous judgements, but testifyed against them; *Luk.* 1. 6. *Ioh.* 7. 50, 51. *Luk.* 23. 50, 51. yet were they not required to forsake their offices and their government. And if they might lawfully retaine their office and government, why might not others resort unto them in their government, and seek redresse of offences, and so by them *tell the Church*, according to the rule, *Mat.* 18. 17?

III. For the further clearing of this poynt, concerning which many are diversly minded, and many stumble at this day also upon occasion of a like difficulty, doubting what is meet to be done, when corruptions doe abound in a true Church (as the Jewes in Christs time were) when as yet some of the Ministers & Governours thereof doe become oppressours of the godly & persecutours of the trueth; we are therefore to observe divers rules of direction according to which both the Jewes then and Christians now in such case are to carry themselves, 1. There is a difference to be put betwixt the causes and matters of complaint, about which men had occasion to goe to the Jewes Synedrion or Eldership. There were some kinde of sinnes, as of open theft, adultery, extortion, sacriledge, legall impurity, Sabath-breaking & divers the like scandals, against which the Pharisees and Rulers of the Jewes were very zealous: *Luk.* 18. 11, 12. *Rom.* 10. 2. *Phil.* 3. 5, 6. *Luk.* 18. 18, 21. *Mark.* 10. 21. And what should hinder the godly from going unto their Presbyterie to seek redresse, and so to *tell the Church* of such offences? In other quæstions touching their traditions they had not the like encouragement to goe unto them. 11. There was a difference to be put betwixt the Rulers of the Jewes to whom they had occasion to complaine. As there was a multitude of Synagogues among them, so there was great variety of the Rulers of those Synagogues; some of them being more modest, humble and attentive to the Gospell then others, as we read of Iairus, Crispus,

pus, Sosthenes, and diverse of the Priests and cheef Rulers: *Mark.* 5. 22, 23. *Act.* 18.8,17. *Mark.* 12.28,32,34. *Ioh.* 12.42. *Act.* 6.7. And to such there was yet the more reason to complaine upon occasion. As for others that shewed themselves open & obstinate contemners of the Gospell & persecuters of Christ, our Saviour taught his Disciples to beware of such, *Matth.* 10. 17. to fly from them, *Ioh.* 11.54. and not rashly to cast the pearles of holy admonition before such as would tread them under their feet, and seek to rend the admonishers, *Mat.* 7.6. *with Prov.* 20.15. *&* 9.8. Paul sometimes went voluntarily unto the Jewish Synagogues. *Act.* 13. 14. *&* 17. 2. *&* 18. 4. sometimes he withdrew himself from such as were hardened & blasphemed; *Act.* 13.46,51. *&* 19.9. 111. For the persons admonishing, there is also a difference to be observed betwixt them; some of them being weake, and some stronger. Such of them as were weake in knowledge and weake in resolution and courage, were taught to take knowledge of their owne infirmity and not to presume above the grace given unto them, but to wait untill God had further prepared & inabled them, by furnishing them with such gifts as were meet and required for the performance of great & hard dueties. *Matt.* 17.9. *Iohn.* 13.36. *Luk.* 5.36,37,38. It was required of them that were to goe unto the Eldershipps of the Jewes, and so to *tell the Church* of corruptions abounding among them, that they should be able to argue from the Scriptures & to convince the gainsayers, in publick as well as in private in the first degree of admonition, *Matt.* 18. 15. and withall to stand constantly as yron pillars against the faces of unrighteous & cruell men. *Ier.* 1.18. *Esa.* 50.7. Peter being yet weak, & presuming above his strength, did therefore fall so greevously. *Matt.* 26.33.74. But for those that are strong, confirmed in knowledge and godly resolution, they are to gird up their loynes for the doing of that which is not so safe for the weake to enterprise. And as the Apostle giving direction in other cases, wherein it was also something hard to discerne and determine what was best to be done, requires men to look unto their resolution & perswasion without wavering or fainting (as in the matter of marriage, of going to a feast with unbeleevers, and eating of meats then in question) and describes their resolution in many words, saying, *He that standeth fast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his owne will, & hath so decreed in his heart, &c.* 1. *Cor.* 7,37. and If any of them that beleeve not bid you to a feast, *& ye be disposed to goe*, or as the words are *and ye will goe, &c.* 1. *Cor.* 10.27. and *Let every man be fully perswaded in his owne minde*: *Rom.* 14. 5. So in the case of going to *tell the Church* among persecuters, every man was and is still to see that he be strong in the Lord & stand fast in his heart. 1v. Even those that were strongest and most resolute, were yet bound to distinguish the times, and in all spirituall wisedome to put difference betwixt occasions. When Paul went bound in the spirit unto Ierusalem, knowing that bonds & afflictions waited for him there, *Act.* 20.22,23. there was no intreaty, no teares & cryes of his godly friends could perswade him to stay, or hold him from going up thither to tell the Church and Rulers of the Jewes such things as God called him to witnesse unto them, *Act.* 21.12,13,14. though he was ready to have bene torne in peeces of that Seditious Church. *Act.* 23. 10. At another time when Paul being bold as a Lyon would

have adventured himself among the tumultuous Ephesians for the defence of his companions in danger, yet not having so expresse and strong a call thereunto as in the former example, he yeelded to the counsell of others & suffered himself to be over-ruled: *when he would have entred in unto the people, the Disciples suffered him not.* Act. 19.30. Here is the wisedome, faith & patience of the Saints; let those that have understanding lay these examples before them, & labour to apply them unto themselves upon like occasions. v. Even those that are the weakest also are to put difference betwixt unadvised going of themselves and a necessary calling. for though men should not rashly expose themselves to danger, yet being brought by others & drawne before a Jewish Synedrion, & being examined touching their profession and practise, it is then required even of the simplest to answer for the trueth with meeknes & reverence, so farre as they know and are able, 1. Pet. 3. 15, and not to betray the trueth by their silence, but to *tell the Church* of the evils to be reformed. Such were and are to remember the promises; that *out of the mouth of babes & sucklings God ordaineth strength, to still the enemy & the avenger:* Psal. 8. 2. that such are *blessed* in *suffering according to the will of God.* Matt. 5. 10, 11, 12. Act. 5. 41. 1. Pet. 4. 19. And thus according to these directions in divers kindes there was occasion to practise in the Jewish Church that Rule of Christ, *Mat.* 18.

Some others, as was noted before, to prove that Christ gave a new rule, *Mat.* 18. doe object that (y) *Christ was to destroy both Citie & Sanctuary; so to force the Iewes to an end of their politie: Dan.* 9. 24. 26. *Luk.* 19. 41, 44. that *Christ hath abrogated through his flesh the hatred, that is the law of commandements which stood in ordinances, &c.* that *we are built, not upon Moses politie that is done away, but upon the foundation of the Apostles & Prophets, &c. Eph.* 2. 15, 19, 20. That (z) *all those old things are passed away, that all things of such nature under the Gospell are made new, and that the same things are shaken and changed, and remaine not now unto us, &c.* 2. Cor. 5. 17. *Heb.* 12. 27. To these I answer:

(y) H. Ainsw. Animadv. p. 14, 15.

(z) H. Iacob, Attest. p. 278, 279.

I. That the Ceremoniall law is abrogate, we willingly grant, and some of the Scriptures here alledged by them doe prove the same; & so much of the Iudiciall law as had a peculiar reference unto the state & condition of the Jewes, & did not in common equity concerne other people as well as them, we acknowledge in like manner to be disannulled, as we have also noted (a) before. But that the spirituall admonitions & censures by the Ecclesiasticall judicatories, were either any Ceremonial or Typicall ordinances, or such as doe not agree with the state of Christian Churches under the new Testament, this remaines for them to shew, if they will make good those allegations of Scripture which they apply to such a purpose. In the meane time we esteeme such allegations to serve our opponites turne no better, then they doe the Anabaptists, who upon a like pretence that Moses politie is abolished, and that the Law is changed and old things passed away, doe thereupon plead that the Civill power of the Magistrate, and the use of the sword is not to be exercised by Christians in the Church of God under the new Testament.

(a) Pag. 36, 37.

II. As for those places, *Dan.* 9. 24. 26. *Luk.* 19. 41, 44. where the destruction of the Citie and Sanctuary is foretold, they doe not prove the abolition of that

that Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction of Synods which we maintaine; becauſe this part of Moſes politie, and this liberty of appeales from one judicatory to another, might have continued even among the Jewes themſelves, though both City and Sanctuary were deſtroyed, and much more may ſtill be retained among Chriſtians, that are not tyed unto the Leviticall prieſthood, nor unto any other legall ceremonies. So the inquiſition for murder was an ordinance of Moſes politie: *Deut.* 21.1--9. though divers ceremonies were in Moſes time annexed thereunto, this hinders not but that thoſe ceremonies being abolished, the Iudiciall law it ſelf for inquiſition after murders, being of common equity, ought ſtill to continue among us.

Againe, it is further to be obſerved how ſome of our oppoſites labouring to finde a difference between Moſes politie and Chriſts rule, have deſcribed unto us ſuch a rule of proceeding in Moſes time, as is not to be acknowledged. *Mr Smith*, as is noted (b) before, makes this to be the order of proceeding in the time of the Law, 1. reproof of ſinne, *Levit.* 19.17. 2. a ſacrifice for the cleanſing of the party reproved, *Lev.* 4.23. 3. death inflicted by the Magiſtrate upon the partie reproved, if he wilfully refuſed to hearken, &c. *Numb.* 15. 30, 31. *Deut.* 17.12. *Mr Ainſworth* agreeth with him in this poynt, & ſayth, (c) *God commanded this duety in his law*, playnly to rebuke our neighbour; *Lev.* 19.17. *that ſo upon warning and ſight of his ſinne, he might bring his ſacrifice & reconcile himſelf unto the Lord whom he had offended. Levit.* 4.23--28. *which if he regarded not, but ſhould doe ought with a high hand, he then was ſayd* to blaſpheme the Lord, and muſt be cut off from among his people, *Numb.* 15. 30, 31. *becauſe he deſpiſed the word of the Lord, &c.* Againe he writes; (d) *That private men forgave not ſinnes in Iſrael, ſo abſolutely touching the Church order or politie, as Chriſtians doe now, is evident by the Law, which bound the offender not onely unto repentance and faith in Chriſt, Act.* 15.9,11. *as alſo to confeſſe his ſinne, Levit.* 5.5. *and ſatiſfy his neighbour offended; Lev.* 6.5. *but withall* to bring a treſpaſſe offering to the Prieſt (*the miniſter of the Church*) *that ſo* the Prieſt making an atonement for him before the Lord, it ſhould be forgiven him. *Lev.* 6.2,5,6,7. *Now under the Goſpell the law is.* If thy brother treſpaſſe againſt thee rebuke him, and if he repent forgive him: *Luk.* 17.3. *neyther is ſuch a man bound to goe to a Miniſter that he may pray for, or forgive him; as the Papiſts by proportion* (e) *doe gather.* Now for anſwer hereunto, and to ſhew how they were miſtaken about the rule of admonition in the old Teſtament, in teaching that men were bound upon admonition to bring an offering, & ſo bound that if they wilfully refuſed or regarded not to doe it, they were to dye or to be cut off from among their people, we are to obſerve that God did not lay ſuch a bond of neceſſity upon his people, and this appeareth by theſe conſiderations:

(b) Pag. 42.

(c) H. Ainſ. Commun. of S.c. 22. p. 440.

(d) Anim. adv. p. 120, 121.

(e) Bellar. de Pœnit. l. 2. c. 3.

1. The * words of the Text, *Levit.* 4. 23--28. being rightly tranſlated doe not inferre ſuch a bond. Whereas the words are commonly tranſlated, *then he ſhall bring his offering, &c.* they ſhould rather have bene thus tranſlated, *and* or *if he will bring his offering, &c.* or thus, *then he may bring his offering, &c.* And ſo the words being conditionall and not imperative, there is no abſolute commandement to bring a ſacrifice: but the ordinance of God in that place is, that if they would bring

* *vehebi.*

bring a sacrifice for their sinne, then they must doe it in such manner as is there prescribed. And there is a double reason for this translation. 1. The particle *vau* is (f) often and very conveniently expounded conditionally by *if* or *and if*, as *Numb.* 5.13,14. & 12.14. *Deut.*24.1,3. *Exod.* 4.23. So the principall Interpreters doe sundry times translate the same: the Chaldee Paraphrasts, both *Onkelos* and *Ionathan*, as also the Greek version, in *Num.* 12.14. So the ancient Arabick version of *Rabbi Saadias*, as also that edition of the Chaldee printed at Constantinople in *Exod.* 4.23. So Tremellius and Iunius in *Gen.*18.30. *Levit.*26.40. *Numb.*12.14. So our English translation in *Exod.* 4.23. *Levit.* 26.40. *Numb.* 12.14. *Deut.*24.3. And to omit a multitude of other interpreters, Mr Ainsworth himself doth sometimes so translate the same, as in those places before specifyed, *Exo.*4.23. *Lev.* 26.40. *Numb.* 12. 14. and further (g) notes that so it ought elswhere to be translated, as in *Mal.* 1.2. & 3.8. 11. Suppose that the conjunction or particle *vau* were not conditionall in this place, yet the word turned into the future tense by *vau hippuc* according to the Hebrew speech, as other simple (h) verbs future, doth not alwayes necessarily imply a commandement, but rather a permission. Though sometimes they import an absolute commandement, as in the Decalogue; yet sometimes they are used to signify what we may doe, and what we are permitted to doe. This is commonly observed by Translatours, who in their translation of the very same forme of the future verb, doe sometimes expresse it by a commanding phrase, *thou shalt doe*, sometimes by a phrase of permission, *thou mayest doe*: for example, in our English translation, *Gen.*2.16. *Lev.* 11.21,22. *Deut.*12.15,20. & 20.19. & 23.20,24,25. & 24.2. *Thou mayest eat*, *Thou mayest lend*, *Thou mayest eat grapes*, *Thou mayest pluck*, *She may goe*, &c. Thus are many of these places translated by Mr Ainsw. himself; and thus in like manner might this place, *Lev.*4.23, 28. be fitly translated, *Then he may bring his offering*, &c. And being so interpreted there is no such bond of necessity contained therein.

(f) Vau omnium aliarum Conjunctionum significationem assumere potest. &c. aliquando conditionē includit. Cevall. & Bertr. in Galeed. p. 44.

(g) Annot. on Lev. 26. 40.

(h) See Galeed, p. 117.

II. As the words and forme of speech in the Text doe admit this interpretation; so the matter it self & the nature of the ordinance doth determine it, & constraine us to entertaine this translation, which shewes it to be a permission: because otherwise it had bene impossible ever to observe it in Israel. The sinnes spoken of in *Lev.*4.2,27. are for the generall nature of them all manner of sinnes, great or small, except presumptuous sinnes. The words of the Text are, *If a soule shall sinne through ignorance against any of the commandements of the Lord, concerning things which ought not to be done, & shall doe against any one of them:* the word *schegagah* there used cōtaining under it all sinnes of infirmity, ignorance, errour, forgetfulnes or unadvisednes. Now the holyest men on earth being ready to offend on this manner every day & houre; if for every dayly unadvised word or deed they had bene bound to bring a sacrifice, & no other way to purge their sinne, thē had it bene utterly impossible to have kept this ordinance: 1. In respect of the cost and charges, especially for the poore, described by this argument, that he * *wants an offering*, so impoverished that he was not able to bring an oblation. *Esa.* 40.20. The poore soule that had but two mites, *Mark.*12.42,44. and the poore man that had but one lamb lying in his bosome, *2. Sam.*12.3. could not purge their dayly sinnes with sacrifices for them

* *hamsuccan terumah.*

them all: especially considering that in this sinne-offering here spoken of, they must of necessity bring either a shee-goat or a lamb-female without blemish: *Lev.* 4. 28, 32. there was no respect of the poore to spare them or to dispense with them for bringing a sacrifice of lesse price, as yet in other cases we see they were dispensed withall. *Lev.* 14. 21, 22, 30, 31. & 12. 6, 7, 8. whereupon the mother of Christ being very poore (as appeareth hence) brought a paire of turtle-doves or two young pigeons, *Luk.* 2. 24. which had not bene lawfull, if she had bene able to have brought a lamb. Now if the Lord had this care to ease the burden of the poore leper at his cleansing, and of the poore woman at her purification, which might fall out to be but once in the yeare, or once in a life time, and to many never in their life; then how much more agreeable is it to the mercy of God, that the charges of the poore should have bene respected in those sacrifices which they might have had occasion to offer even every day in the yeare? but hence we may gather that this sacrifice was not of necessity imposed upon them. Yea it had bene impossible for the richer sort to have sustained this charge, especially in the yeares of dearth or scarsity. All the cattell upon the mountaines of Israel, with the sheep of Kedar and Nebaioth were not so many as the knowne sinnes of Israel, which needed this sacrifice. 11. In respect of the labour and travell, this order was not possible to be observed, when for every knowne sinne they should take a journey to Ierusalem, many of the Israelites dwelling divers dayes journeys from the Temple. Abraham travelling from Beersheba in the South to offer his sonne in the mount of Morijah, where the Temple was afterwards built, 2. *Chron.* 3. 1. came not thither before the third day, *Gen.* 22. 2, 3, 4. And some others that dwelt in the Tribes Northward from Ierusalem, were as farre againe distant from the Temple, as appeares by the (i) Geographicall description of that country; so that to goe and come & to performe that sacrifice could not be much lesse then a weeks work unto divers of them: & every week in the yeare they might have occasion to take this journey, if this sacrifice, *Lev.* 4. had bene exacted of them. Yea as Ioseph & Mary having bene at the feast, when they had come a dayes journey homeward from Ierusalem, seeking the child Iesus and not finding him in the company did returne back againe to Ierusalem: *Luk.* 2. 43, 44, 45. so many sinners having offered this sacrifice and comming homeward, might in the way come to the knowledge of some new sinne, and so be forced to goe back to Ierusalem to offer againe; yea and this so often that all their life long they might doe no other work but travell up and downe to offer sacrifices. But seeing it was impossible for the tribes and families of Israel to endure such travell, we may therefore conclude from hence, that both *Mr Ainsworth* and *Mr Smith* have erred in teaching that Israel was bound unto such a rule.

(i) Cl. Ptol. Geogr. l. 5. c. 16. tab. 4.

But against this it may be objected from the interpretation of the Rabbines alledged by *Mr Ainsworth*, that these errours for which the Sinne-offering was to be brought were not so many & common, but few and rare, and that therefore there was no such impossibility of purging them by sacrifice. Therefore to cleare the Text, and to vindicate the ordinance of God from the absurd traditions of the Thalmudists, and that it may appeare how men have corrupted the Rules of ad-

monition & discipline, as well in the Old as in the New Testament, I will briefly poynt out some of their vaine glosses, & shew their contrary extremities about this particular statute.

The errours & sinnes for which this sacrifice was appointed are in one extremity restrained too much by the Jew-doctours: 1. By expounding them onely of such works and deeds as are distinguished from thoughts and from words. Because the Text sayth, *shall doe*, (k) this they restraine to deeds and facts, and therefore they teach that the Blasphemer because his sinne was in word & not in deed, was not to bring this sinne-offering. This glosse is a vaine and false collection; because the H. Ghost in the Scripture, doth ordinarily describe the words, speeches and savings of men under the phrase of doing, as appeares, *Psal.* 15.2, 3. *with vers.* 5. *& Psal.* 50.19,20. *with vers.* 21. And what reason is there that the sinnes of slandering, rayling, cursing, perjury, blasphemy, being repented of should not be purged by sacrifice as well as other hainous facts & deeds? II. By a second restriction of these errours in deeds and facts unto the transgressing of negative commandements onely. Herein they (l) shew themselves partiall in the Law, dividing it into 613 commandements, & those againe into 248 affirmative cõmandements according to the supposed number of bones in a mans body, & 365 negative cõmandements according to the number of dayes in the yeare: & the sinne-offering they require onely for the breach of negative cõmandements, pretending a reason from the Text, which makes mention of *all the cõmandements concerning things which should not be done.* Hereupon they say, that no sinne-offering is to be brought for neglecting of Circumcision or the Passeover, because they are affirmative commandements. And thus at once they cast out 248 kindes of sinnes, according to the number of the affirmative cõmandements, from having any part in the Sinne-offering. And this their exposition is not onely alledged but allowed & approved of *Mr Ainsw.* when he saith, (m) *The sinne-offerings in ch.* 4. *were for greater offences, in doing things forbidden of God*, viz. in the negative commandements. And to prevent an objection that might be made against this distinction, he sayth, (n) *Other sinnes* (viz. against the affirmative commandements) *in omitting things to be done, were expiated by Burnt-offerings, which were offered dayly for the whole Church, or by particular persons, as they would bring them, as it shewed on Lev.* 1. *Also by the sacrifices offered on Atonement day, whereof see Lev.* 16. *&c.* But how vaine is this distinction? what just warrant is there that the expiation of sinnes of omission, against the affirmative commandements, should be restrained and applyed with such distinction unto the Burnt-offerings or unto that one day of Atonement? It is a generall rule and received of Divines that in expounding the commandements the affirmative part should be comprehended under the negative, and the negative under the affirmative. And there is ground for this from the word of God, who in his speech sometimes comprehendeth all our obedience of the Law under an affirmative commandement, as *Deut.* 5. 33. sometimes under a negative, as *Deut.* 8. 11. *with Deut.* 5. 32, *&c.* III. By a third restriction they doe yet further limit & appropriate this Sinne-offering to the ignorant or negligent breach of such negative commandements, for the presumptuous transgression whereof men deserved

(k) H. Ainsw. Annot. on Lev. 4. 2.

(l) Ibidem.

(m) Annot. on Lev. 5. 1.

(n) Annot. on Lev. 4. 2.

cut-

cutting off by the Law, as is noted (o) in generall by Mr Ainſworth, for the interpretation and illuſtration of this ordinance. But that the Reader may the better diſcerne and judge thereof, I will ſet down the particular errours: (p) *The firſt when a man did ly with his mother, 2. with his wives mother, 3. with his mothers mother, 4. with his fathers mother, 5. with his daughter, 6. with his daughters daughter, 7. with his ſons daughter, 8. with his wives daughter, 9. with her daughters daughter, 10. with her ſons daughter, 11. with his ſiſter, 12. with his ſiſter, of his fathers wife, 13. with his fathers ſiſter, 14. with his mothers ſiſter, 15. with his wives ſiſter, 16. with his fathers wife, 17. with his fathers brothers wife, 18. with his ſonnes wife, 19. with his brothers wife, 20. with a mans wife, 21. with a menſtruous woman, 22. with a male, 23. with his father, 24. with his fathers brother, 25. with a beaſt, 26. a woman lying with a beaſt.* And beſides theſe 26 monſtrons and unnaturall pollutions, they reckon 17 other tranſgreſſions, 1. *Idolatry, 2. giving of their ſeed to Molech, 3. having a familiar ſpirit, 4. to be a wizard, 5. profaning of the Sabath, 6. to work upon Atonement day, 7. to eat or drink on Atonement day, 8. to eat the remainder,* (viz. of the ſacrifice on the third day, *Lev.* 7. 17, 18.) *9. to eat leaven at the Paſſeover, 10. to eat fat, 11. to eat blood, 12. to eat the abominable thing, 13. to kill holy things without the court, 14. to offer ſacrifice without the court, 15. to make the anoynting oyle, 16. to make the ſweet incenſe, 17. to anoynt with that anoynting oyle.* Unto theſe 43 particular and enormous errours they reſtraine the Sinne-offering. As by the former reſtriction they excluded all the 248 affirmative commandements, ſo by this of 365 negative precepts they exclude 322. By theſe and ſundry other groundles reſtrictions they doe many wayes make both this and other commandements and ordinances of God of no effect by their traditions, and as for private perſons, ſo alſo for the Prieſt, the Congregation and Rulers, which being ſo vaine, I will not inſiſt upon further refutation of them; they being alſo many wayes contradictory unto themſelves about the ſame.

(o) Ibidem.

(p) Maimony in Shegagoth, c. 1.

And as the Jewes doe thus offend in unjuſt reſtrictions, ſo doe they alſo in a contrary extremity of extending the words of this ordinance in ſome other reſpects too farre: as when it is ſayd according to the tranſlation of Mr Ainſw. *and ſhall doe of any one of them. Levit.* 4. 2. hence they gather that this Sinne-offering is to be brought by ſuch as break any piece or part of thoſe negative commandements; (q) as for example, if upon the Sabbath one ſhould write *Shim* of *Shimeon*, *Nah* of *Nahor*, *Dan* of *Daniel*, againſt ſuch they doe apply the words of this commandement. Now if for ſo ſmall a tranſgreſſion as writing with a pen upon the Sabath but half a word, a ſyllable or two letters of a mans name, they were bound to bring this ſinne-offering, and ſo accordingly for other ſinnes of like nature and weight, what man though the holyeſt on earth, could have endured the labour and charge of ſo many ſacrifices as ſuch kinde of ſinnes might have occaſioned? Though *Bellarmine* erred in labouring to (r) prove auricular confeſſion of ſinnes unto the Prieſt from the legall ſacrifices, as Mr Ainſworth mentions (though the place be cited amiſſe, which I ſuppoſe to be the Printers fault, lib. 2. for lib. 3.) yet Mr Ainſw. himſelf doth erre likewiſe in deſcribing an impoſſible & unreaſonable order in the Old Teſtament, as Bellar. doth for the New.

(q) R. Solomon Iarchi, on Lev. 4. 2. R. Moſes Mikkotſi in Sepher mitſvoth gadol, præcept affir. 213.

(r) Bellar. de Pœnit. l. 3. c. 3.

Laſtly, ſuppoſe there had bene ſuch a bond of neceſſity layd upon the Jewes of

old, to bring a ſacrifice for each ſinne when it was made knowne unto them; yet this proves not that any new duety was preſcribed in *Matt.* 18. which was not taught in the Law before. We know that the legall ſacrifices and ceremonies are wholly abrogate: yet this hinders not but that the morall dueties obſerved in the midſt of thoſe ceremonies may ſtill remaine, when the ceremonies are aboliſhed. When the Miniſters of the Lord in old time entred into their offices with knowledge and conſent of the people, and together at the ſame time were conſecrated with divers ſacrifices and other ceremonies, *Numb.* 8. 9, 10, *&c. Levit.* 8. 2, 3, 4, 5. though the ceremonies of conſecration be aboliſhed, yet the peoples right of knowledge and conſent is not therefore aboliſhed. The Browniſts themſelves alledge (f) the ſame places for the continuance thereof: and why can they not obſerve the ſame for the rule in *Matt.* 18. notwithſtanding any ceremonyes that had formerly bene annexed unto the practiſe & obſervation of ſome dueties contained in that rule?

(f) Confeſ. art. 23. Apolog. pof. 5. p. 46, 47, 48.

Moreover, it may be obſerved from Mr Ainſworths owne words that the Rule in *Matt.* 18. and in ſpeciall that which concernes the third degree of admonition, was for the ſubſtance of it no new rule, but that which was required and practiſed under the Law. In Iſrael they *told the Church* two wayes: 1. By telling the Governours that repreſented the Church, becauſe it then alſo *chiefly appertained to the Miniſters & watchmen of the Church* to give the people warning, to admoniſh them of their wicked wayes, to teach the people the difference between the holy and profane, &c. Divers Scriptures are (t) alledged by Mr Ainſw. himſelf for proof hereof, as *Ezek.* 3. 17, 18, *&c. Ezek.* 44. 23. *Ier.* 1. 10. *Hoſ.* 6. 5. *&c.* It was therefore no new rule in the new Teſtament when the like order was eſtabliſhed for going firſt unto the Elderſhip and ſeeking redreſſe of evill by them. Mr Ainſw. acknowledgeth, that (v) *the keyes of the kingdome of heaven are in more ſpeciall manner given unto them*; and therefore in ſpeciall manner ought they to be told and ſpoken unto for the reformation of evils: ſeeing *they were to guide and goe before the people, as in other affaires, ſo in adminiſtring the cenſures of the Church*; therefore ordinarily matters were to be brought unto them before they were brought unto the whole Congregatiõ. 11. As it is the ordinance of God in the new Teſtament, 1. *Cor.* 5. & accordingly the practiſe of the Reformed Churches in theſe countries, that the more weighty affaires & cenſures of the Church ſhould not be adminiſtred without knowledge and conſent of the body of the Church; ſo that none is either received for a member of the Church, or caſt out by excommunication, but they doe firſt *tell the Church*; even the whole Congregatiõ is ſolemnely & publickly acquainted therewith, & liberty granted unto them to ſhew their aſſent or diſſent therein: ſo Mr Ainſw. himſelf acknowledgeth that there was a like order in the old Teſtament. The Scriptures which he alledgeth, and his manner of arguing from them doth import ſo much. Of Iſrael he ſaith, (x) *Vnto all & every of the Iſraelites, was commended the care & obſervation of all Gods ſtatutes; that neither all nor any of them, man nor woman, nor familie, nor tribe, ſhould forſake the Lord, nor ſuffer among them any root to bring forth gall and wormwood, &c. Deut.* 29. 18. So of the multitude of beleevers and people in the new Teſtament, he writes in like manner, that (y) *they were willed to exhort and admoniſh*

(t) Cõmun. of Sts, c. 22. p. 450.

(v) Ibid. p. 451.

(x) Cõmun. of S. c. 18. § 8.

(y) Ibid. § 9.

each

each other; even the Officers of the Churches, &c. and to look that no root of bitternes ſprung up and troubled them, &c. Heb. 12. 15. &c. Againe he ſaith, (z) *Even the leprous & unclean, though the tryall of them apperteyned to the Prieſts, Lev. 13. yet all the children of Iſrael were to look that ſuch were removed out of the hoſt; yea the care of the Prieſts purity in their adminiſtration, apperteyned to all the people. Levit. 21. 1, 8, 24. And long after, both in counſels, & in the redreſſing of publick evils and treſpaſſes, all Iſrael indifferently, had their hand and preſence; as the Scripture ſheweth. 2. Chron. 30. 21, 23. Ezra. 10. 1, 9, 12, &c.* Then preſently he parallels the courſe of the Churches in the New Teſtament with this ſuppoſed practiſe in the Old, ſaying, *The Churches in the Apoſtles dayes had alſo the like right and liberty: for the multitudes of beleevers were both beholders and actors in the common affaires, &c.* Afterwards againe, ſpeaking of the rules of admonition & of the cenſures of the Church, he ſaith, (a) *The keeping of which rules belongeth to all the Saints, as the commandement directed of old to the children of Iſrael (Num. 5. 2. Levit. 19. 17.) and in the new Teſtament to all the bretbren & Church, doth ſhew. Matt. 18. 15. 1. Cor. 5.* And thus by his owne confeſſion, yea even according to his owne opinion, in reſpect of the Churches power and the peoples right, there was no new rule given by Chriſt in *Mat. 18.*

(z) Ibid. c. 18. § 8.

(a) Ibid. c. 22. § 12 p. 449.

Whereas it is objected that the Jewiſh Synedrion (b) *by the inſtitution of God was merely Civill, &c.* that (c) *Moſes appointed neither Iudges nor Elders in Citie or* Synedrion, *but they were Magiſtrates to execute the judgements of the law, & had the ſword to chaſtiſe the body and puniſh with death, &c.* The errour of this aſſertion hath bene ſhewed (d) before from the Scriptures, *Deut. 17. & 2. Chron. 19.* From theſe places is the diſtinction of Civill and Eccleſiaſticall judgements maintained by many learned Writers, as (e) D. Rainolds, (f) Mr Cartwright, (g) Mr Fenner, and the (h) Defender of him, and moſt largely by (i) G. Bucerus. As for H. Barrow, he ſufficiently refutes himſelf when he acknowledgeth that *the Prieſts did beare the charge and had the deciding of all Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, Numb. 18. Deut. 17.* This they could not doe without judging of them; & therefore it appeareth hence that they had a double Synedrion, one Eccleſiaſticall, the other Civill.

(b) H. Barr. Refut. of Giff. p. 76.
(c) D. Bilſō, perper. gov. ch. 4. p. 21.
(d) Pag. 34, 35, 41.
(e) Conf. with Hart. c. 6. div. 2. p. 203, 204.
(f) First reply to D. Whitg. p. 192. Secōd reply, latter part. p. 152, 153.
(g) Counterp. in part of Regiſt. p. 490, 491.
(h) Ibid. p. 522.
(i) Diſſ. de Gub. Eccl. p. 59. &c.

CHAP. VI.

The third Argument, taken from the practiſe of the primitive Churches, in the Apoſtles times.

OUr third Argument is taken from the practiſe of the primitive Chriſtian Churches, after the Aſcenſion of Chriſt, from which we reaſon on this manner: That government of the Church which is commended unto us & approved by the example of the Apoſtles and Apoſtolick Churches, is worthily to be embraced of us. But the government of the Church by Synods, which beſides their counſell and admonition, doe alſo with authority judge and determine the weightieſt cauſes and affaires of particular Churches, is commended unto us as is above ſayd: Therefore, &c.

The Assumption of this Argument is proved:

I. By that holy assembly or Synod which is recorded *Act.* 1.15--26. wherein there was not onely counsell given, but also an exercise of Ecclesiasticall power & authoritie, and that in such a busines as was of great and rare importance, in the choyse of a new Apostle. This Assembly was not an ordinary Congregation or particular Church, but it was a Synodicall assembly, and performed such a work as did not belong unto any one particular Church. This appeares divers wayes: 1. In respect of the persons of whom this Assembly did consist, and these againe of two sorts; First, of Apostles, who being such persons as were not tyed unto any particular Church, but had an universall charge; *Matt.* 28.19. *Rom.* 10.15, 18. This commission was unto them as much as if they had had a speciall delegation from many or all Churches, so that their presence and concurrence was sufficient to make this Assembly in some measure, as a generall or universall Synod. These eleven Apostles having also a peculiar charge to be at this time at Ierusalem, the place of this Assembly, and to tarry there for a while (*Luk.* 24.49. *Act.* 1.4.) were by divine direction brought unto this Synod. Secondly, for other persons, the Disciples that were present at this Assembly, it appeares they were from divers places; some of them from Galilee, as the brethren of Christ there mentioned, *Act.* 1.14. *with Mat.* 13.55,56. & how many of them were inhabitants of Ierusalem or Iudæa, it is not specifyed: so that the 120 persons met together at this time, *Act.* 1.15. cānot be sayd to have bene a distinct particular Church of persons dwelling in Ierusalem, but an occasionall assembly or Synod upon such ground as the story of the Scripture doth manifest. 11. In respect of the busines it self here performed, viz. the election of an Apostle: it was such a work as did not appertaine unto any one particular Church, but all Churches had interest therein, seeing *the care of all the Churches* was cōmitted unto the Apostles. 2. *Cor.* 11.28. All Churches were alike bound to beware of false Apostles, that could *transforme themselves into the Apostles of Christ.* 2. *Cor.* 11.13. It had bene a presumption in any one Church, and a wrong unto all the rest, if without their consent, one alone should have chosen an Apostle: especially considering there were even at this time a multitude of the faithfull in other places whom this work concerned. Many had bene lately converted by the ministery of Iohn Baptist: *Matt.* 11.12. and now immediately before the Ascension of Christ we read of more then 500 brethren at once which were witnesses of the Resurrection of Christ. 1. *Cor.* 15. 6. These 120 had done injury unto them, save that these generall persons, the Apostles, called of God for the service of all Churches, did for them by divine appointment appeare in this Synod. 111. In respect of the manner of this election, which was made with a threefold limitation, 1. Unto one of those men which had companyed with the Apostles all the time that the Lord Iesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptisme of Iohn, even untill that same day that he was taken up from them. *Act.* 1.21,22. Now these Disciples that thus waited on Christ, such as Barsabas and Matthias were, being no inhabitants of Ierusalem, what power had a particular Church to determine and dispose of them that were no members of their particular society? 2. There was a restraint from absolute electing of any one

one of these: they were onely allowed to present two, and to offer them unto the choyse of the Lord. *vers.* 23. 24. 3. The way and meanes of inquiring the will of God herein, was determined and restrained unto a Lot, whereby the judgment and definitive sentence of God was declared unto the Synod that rested therein. And by these extraordinary directions it pleased God to honour this first Synod of the new Testament.

It is here also to be observed, that although some Writers have spoken of this election as made by a particular Church, yet we have sundry learned men consenting with us in the exposition of this story, who labouring to shew the profit and necessity of Synods, (a) doe argue from this place, *Act.* 1. and affirme that in the New Testament the Apostles and whole Church did celebrate a Synod for the choosing of Matthias into the place of Iudas. The Professours of Leyden to the same purpose (b) alledge this example, *Act.* 1. and call it *the first Synod at Ierusalem.*

(a) Whitak. de Concil. qu. 1. c. 3.
(b) Synopſ. pur. Theol. Diſp. 49.

II. The example of that renowned Synod which is recorded *Act.* 15. is a sufficiēt warrant, wherein the use and authority of Classes and Synods is commended unto us, and this not onely for counsell and admonition, but also for the judgement of causes and for the exercise of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction. As that which went before the Synod, namely the great dissention about a dangerous errour, with seeking of redresse by a solemne deputation of messengers from the Church of Antioch (*Act.* 15. 1, 2.) did call for help in the most effectuall manner: so the things done in the Synod are an evidence of the authority which they used therein, both by a definitive sentence which they pronounced concerning that controversy which was brought unto them; *vers.* 28, 29. and by an authentick ambassage of chosen men sent from that Assembly of Apostles, Elders and brethren, both to carry the Epistle that was written, and by word of mouth to declare the same things, *vers.* 22, 23, 25, 27. That also which is noted to have bene done after the Synod in the publication of the acts thereof, doth also beare witnesse touching the authority of those acts, in that they are called *the decrees, ordained of the Apostles and Elders, &c. Act.* 16. 4. The fruit also which by the blessing of God followed hereupon, in being a meanes of great consolation, and establishment of the Churches in the faith (*Act.* 15. 31. & 16. 5.) is to be considered as an argument whereby the H. Ghost doth further commend unto us the authority of such Synods in the right government of the Church.

Upon this example doe generally all judicious Writers build the authority of Synods, as upon a sure foundation & groundwork.

Calvine saith that (c) *here is prescribed of God the forme and order of gathering Synods, &c.*

(c) Cōment. in Act. 15. 6.

Beza upon this place, (d) having shewed that here was a Προβούλευμα, or foregoing consultation of the Apostles and Elders, which was related unto the whole Church, and ratifyed in the common assembly thereof, he affirmeth that this was *the right forme of a lawfull and true Apostolick Synod, &c.* And both these are to be understood of such Synods as exercised authority of Ecclesiasticall censure, according to the practise of those Churches wherein they lived, of which

(d) Annot. maj. in Act. 15. 12. & v. 23.

more

The Assumption of this Argument is proved:

I. By that holy assembly or Synod which is recorded *Act.* 1.15--26. wherein there was not onely counsell given, but also an exercise of Ecclesiasticall power & authoritie, and that in such a busines as was of great and rare importance, in the choyse of a new Apostle. This Assembly was not an ordinary Congregation or particular Church, but it was a Synodicall assembly, and performed such a work as did not belong unto any one particular Church. This appeares divers wayes: 1. In respect of the persons of whom this Assembly did consist, and these againe of two sorts; First, of Apostles, who being such persons as were not tyed unto any particular Church, but had an universall charge; *Matt.* 28. 19. *Rom.* 10. 15, 18. This commission was unto them as much as if they had had a speciall delegation from many or all Churches, so that their presence and concurrence was sufficient to make this Assembly in some measure, as a generall or universall Synod. These eleven Apostles having also a peculiar charge to be at this time at Ierusalem, the place of this Assembly, and to tarry there for a while (*Luk.* 24.49. *Act.* 1.4.) were by divine direction brought unto this Synod. Secondly, for other persons, the Disciples that were present at this Assembly, it appeares they were from divers places; some of them from Galilee, as the brethren of Christ there mentioned, *Act.* 1.14. *with Mat.* 13.55,56. & how many of them were inhabitants of Ierusalem or Iudæa, it is not specifyed: so that the 120 persons met together at this time, *Act.* 1.15. cānot be sayd to have bene a distinct particular Church of persons dwelling in Ierusalem, but an occasionall assembly or Synod upon such ground as the story of the Scripture doth manifest. 11. In respect of the busines it self here performed, viz. the election of an Apostle: it was such a work as did not appertaine unto any one particular Church, but all Churches had interest therein, seeing *the care of all the Churches* was cōmitted unto the Apostles. 2. Cor. 11.28. All Churches were alike bound to beware of false Apostles, that could *transforme themselves into the Apostles of Christ.* 2. Cor. 11.13. It had bene a presumption in any one Church, and a wrong unto all the rest, if without their consent, one alone should have chosen an Apostle: especially considering there were even at this time a multitude of the faithfull in other places whom this work concerned. Many had bene lately converted by the ministery of Iohn Baptist: *Matt.* 11.12. and now immediately before the Ascension of Christ we read of more then 500 brethren at once which were witnesses of the Resurrection of Christ. 1. Cor. 15. 6. These 120 had done injury unto them, save that these generall persons, the Apostles, called of God for the service of all Churches, did for them by divine appointment appeare in this Synod. 111. In respect of the manner of this election, which was made with a threefold limitation, 1. Unto one of those men which had companyed with the Apostles all the time that the Lord Iesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptisme of Iohn, even untill that same day that he was taken up from them. *Act.* 1.21,22. Now these Disciples that thus waited on Christ, such as Barsabas and Matthias were, being no inhabitants of Ierusalem, what power had a particular Church to determine and dispose of them that were no members of their particular society? 2. There was a restraint from absolute electing of any one

one of these: they were onely allowed to present two, and to offer them unto the choyse of the Lord. *vers.* 23. 24. 3. The way and meanes of inquiring the will of God herein, was determined and restrained unto a Lot, whereby the judgment and definitive sentence of God was declared unto the Synod that rested therein. And by these extraordinary directions it pleased God to honour this first Synod of the new Testament.

It is here also to be observed, that although some Writers have spoken of this election as made by a particular Church, yet we have sundry learned men consenting with us in the exposition of this story, who labouring to shew the profit and necessity of Synods, (a) doe argue from this place, *Act.* 1. and affirme that in the New Testament the Apostles and whole Church did celebrate a Synod for the choosing of Matthias into the place of Iudas. The Professours of Leyden to the same purpose (b) alledge this example, *Act.* 1. and call it *the first Synod at Ierusalem.*

(a) Whitak. de Concil. qu. 1. c. 3.

(b) Synopf. pur. Theol. Disp. 49.

II. The example of that renowned Synod which is recorded *Act.* 15. is a sufficiēt warrant, wherein the use and authority of Classes and Synods is commended unto us, and this not onely for counsell and admonition, but also for the judgement of causes and for the exercise of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction. As that which went before the Synod, namely the great dissention about a dangerous errour, with seeking of redresse by a solemne deputation of messengers from the Church of Antioch (*Act.* 15. 1, 2.) did call for help in the most effectuall manner: so the things done in the Synod are an evidence of the authority which they used therein, both by a definitive sentence which they pronounced concerning that controversy which was brought unto them; *vers.* 28, 29. and by an authentick ambassage of chosen men sent from that Assembly of Apostles, Elders and brethren, both to carry the Epistle that was written, and by word of mouth to declare the same things, *vers.* 22, 23, 25, 27. That also which is noted to have bene done after the Synod in the publication of the acts thereof, doth also beare witnesse touching the authority of those acts, in that they are called *the decrees, ordained of the Apostles and Elders, &c. Act.* 16. 4. The fruit also which by the blessing of God followed hereupon, in being a meanes of great consolation, and establishment of the Churches in the faith (*Act.* 15. 31. & 16. 5.) is to be considered as an argument whereby the H. Ghost doth further commend unto us the authority of such Synods in the right government of the Church.

Upon this example doe generally all judicious Writers build the authority of Synods, as upon a sure foundation & groundwork.

Calvine saith that (c) *here is prescribed of God the forme and order of gathering Synods, &c.*

(c) Cōment. in Act. 15. 6.

Beza upon this place, (d) having shewed that here was a Προβούλευμα, or foregoing consultation of the Apostles and Elders, which was related unto the whole Church, and ratifyed in the common assembly thereof, he affirmeth that this was *the right forme of a lawfull and true Apostolick Synod, &c.* And both these are to be understood of such Synods as exercised authority of Ecclesiasticall censure, according to the practise of those Churches wherein they lived, of which

(d) Annot. maj. in Act. 15. 12. & v. 23.

more

The Assumption of this Argument is proved:

I. By that holy assembly or Synod which is recorded *Act.* 1.15--26. wherein there was not onely counsell given, but also an exercise of Eccleſiasticall power & authoritie, and that in such a busines as was of great and rare importance, in the choyse of a new Apostle. This Assembly was not an ordinary Congregation or particular Church, but it was a Synodicall assembly, and performed such a work as did not belong unto any one particular Church. This appeares divers wayes: 1. In respect of the persons of whom this Assembly did consist, and these againe of two sorts; First, of Apostles, who being such persons as were not tyed unto any particular Church, but had an universall charge; *Matt.* 28. 19. *Rom.* 10. 15, 18. This commission was unto them as much as if they had had a speciall delegation from many or all Churches, so that their presence and concurrence was sufficient to make this Assembly in some measure, as a generall or universall Synod. These eleven Apostles having also a peculiar charge to be at this time at Ierusalem, the place of this Assembly, and to tarry there for a while (*Luk.* 24.49. *Act.* 1.4.) were by divine direction brought unto this Synod. Secondly, for other persons, the Disciples that were present at this Assembly, it appeares they were from divers places; some of them from Galilee, as the brethren of Christ there mentioned, *Act.* 1.14. *with Mat.* 13.55,56. & how many of them were inhabitants of Ierusalem or Iudæa, it is not specifyed: so that the 120 persons met together at this time, *Act.* 1.15. cānot be sayd to have bene a distinct particular Church of persons dwelling in Ierusalem, but an occasionall assembly or Synod upon such ground as the story of the Scripture doth manifest. 11. In respect of the busines it self here performed, viz. the election of an Apostle: it was such a work as did not appertaine unto any one particular Church, but all Churches had intereſt therein, seeing *the care of all the Churches* was cōmitted unto the Apostles. 2. *Cor.* 11.28. All Churches were alike bound to beware of false Apostles, that could *transforme themselves into the Apostles of Christ.* 2. *Cor.* 11.13. It had bene a presumption in any one Church, and a wrong unto all the rest, if without their consent, one alone should have chosen an Apostle: especially considering there were even at this time a multitude of the faithfull in other places whom this work concerned. Many had bene lately converted by the ministery of Iohn Baptist: *Matt.* 11.12. and now immediately before the Ascension of Christ we read of more then 500 brethren at once which were witnesses of the Resurrection of Christ. 1. *Cor.* 15. 6. These 120 had done injury unto them, save that these generall persons, the Apostles, called of God for the service of all Churches, did for them by divine appointment appeare in this Synod. III. In respect of the manner of this election, which was made with a threefold limitation, 1. Unto one of those men which had companyed with the Apostles all the time that the Lord Iesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptisme of Iohn, even untill that same day that he was taken up from them. *Act.* 1.21,22. Now these Disciples that thus waited on Christ, such as Barsabas and Matthias were, being no inhabitants of Ierusalem, what power had a particular Church to determine and dispose of them that were no members of their particular society? 2. There was a restraint from absolute electing of any one

one of these: they were onely allowed to present two, and to offer them unto the choyse of the Lord. *vers.* 23. 24. 3. The way and meanes of inquiring the will of God herein, was determined and restrained unto a Lot, whereby the judgment and definitive sentence of God was declared unto the Synod that rested therein. And by these extraordinary directions it pleased God to honour this first Synod of the new Testament.

It is here also to be observed, that although some Writers have spoken of this election as made by a particular Church, yet we have sundry learned men consenting with us in the exposition of this story, who labouring to shew the profit and necessity of Synods, (a) doe argue from this place, *Act.* 1. and affirme that in the New Testament the Apostles and whole Church did celebrate a Synod for the choosing of Matthias into the place of Iudas. The Professours of Leyden to the same purpose (b) alledge this example, *Act.* 1. and call it *the first Synod at Ierusalem.*

(a) Whitak. de Concil. qu. 1. c. 3.

(b) Synopſ. pur. Theol. Diſp. 49.

II. The example of that renowned Synod which is recorded *Act.* 15. is a sufficiēt warrant, wherein the use and authority of Classes and Synods is commended unto us, and this not onely for counsell and admonition, but also for the judgement of causes and for the exercise of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction. As that which went before the Synod, namely the great dissention about a dangerous errour, with seeking of redresse by a solemne deputation of messengers from the Church of Antioch (*Act.* 15. 1, 2.) did call for help in the most effectuall manner: so the things done in the Synod are an evidence of the authority which they used therein, both by a definitive sentence which they pronounced concerning that controversy which was brought unto them; *vers.* 28, 29. and by an authentick ambassage of chosen men sent from that Assembly of Apostles, Elders and brethren, both to carry the Epistle that was written, and by word of mouth to declare the same things, *vers.* 22, 23, 25, 27. That also which is noted to have bene done after the Synod in the publication of the acts thereof, doth also beare witnesse touching the authority of those acts, in that they are called *the decrees, ordained of the Apostles and Elders, &c. Act.* 16. 4. The fruit also which by the blessing of God followed hereupon, in being a meanes of great consolation, and establishment of the Churches in the faith (*Act.* 15. 31. & 16. 5.) is to be considered as an argument whereby the H. Ghost doth further commend unto us the authority of such Synods in the right government of the Church.

Upon this example doe generally all judicious Writers build the authority of Synods, as upon a sure foundation & groundwork.

Calvine saith that (c) *here is prescribed of God the forme and order of gathering Synods, &c.*

(c) Cōment. in Act. 15. 6.

Beza upon this place, (d) having shewed that here was a Προβούλευμα, or foregoing consultation of the Apostles and Elders, which was related unto the whole Church, and ratifyed in the common assembly thereof, he affirmeth that this was *the right forme of a lawfull and true Apostolick Synod, &c.* And both these are to be understood of such Synods as exercised authority of Ecclesiasticall censure, according to the practise of those Churches wherein they lived, of which more

(d) Annot. maj. in Act. 15. 12. & v. 23.

more hereafter.

Bullinger obſerveth here (as is noted by (e) Marlorate) that this cuſtome was in old time diligently kept of the holy Biſhops in imitation of the Apoſtles, and complaineth of the neglect thereof.

(e) Expoſ. Eccleſ. in Act. 15.6.

D. *Rainolds*, when as the Papiſt objected unto him that there muſt be *a chief Iudge* to end controverſies, to keep the trueth of faith, & peace of the Church, that it be not peſtered with hereſies and ſchiſmes; he anſwers thereunto, (f) that *The wiſedome of God hath committed that chiefrie of judgement (ſo to call it) not to the ſoveraigne power of one, but to the common care of many. For when there was a controverſy in the Church of* Antioch *about the obſervation of the law of* Moſes, *ſome Iewes teaching contrarie to that which* Paul *and* Barnabas *taught*: they ordained that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, ſhould goe up to Ieruſalem, to the Apoſtles and Elders about that queſtion. *Act.* 15.2. *And ſo by their common agreement & decree, the controverſy was ended, the trueth of faith kept, and peace maintained in the Church. After which example the* (g) *Biſhops (that ſucceeded them) made the like aſſemblies, on the like occaſions: and by common conference took order for ſuch matters, both of doctrine and diſcipline, as concerned in common the ſtate of their Church. So did the Apoſtles and Apoſtolike men, provide againſt ſchiſmes and hereſies. Their wiſedome reached not unto the policie of one chiefe judge.* Thus D. *Rainolds* doth many wayes acknowledge the authority of Synods: he calleth that power which they have, *the chiefrie of judgement*: he avoucheth that they have it by divine right, that *the wiſedome of God hath committed it* unto them: he pleadeth from the forenamed warrant, *Act.* 15. he extendeth this power unto matters *both of Doctrine and Diſcipline*: the teſtimonies which in his margine he alledgeth out of the Eccleſiaſticall hiſtory, to ſhew that *the like aſſemblies* were kept in ſucceeding times, are ſuch as ſpeak of their excommunicating wicked Hereticks, viz. *Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l.5. c.14. &c. l.7. c.26,28. &c.* whereby it appeares that he allowed unto Synods not onely counſell or admonition, but a power of exerciſing Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction & cenſure. Thoſe Councels mentioned and poynted at by him, for inſtances of this *chiefrie of judgement*, were ſuch as did not onely admoniſh, but alſo determine and judge of cauſes: The Synod of (h) *Ancyra* in *Galatia* made moſt ſevere Eccleſiaſticall lawes for the excluding of ſuch as did fall in time of perſecution: The Synod of (i) *Gangris* in *Paphlagonia* exerciſed Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction in depoſing *Euſtathius*, Biſhop of *Sebaſtia* for his errours: and the like might be noted for the reſt. Whatſoever particular errours were in any of theſe, yet the authority and juriſdiction it ſelf is approved of him as proceeding from the wiſedome of God, declared in this place, *Act.* 15.

(f) Conf. with Hart, c. 6. div. 2. p. 206.

(g) Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 14, & 21. & 22. lib. 7. c. 26. & 28. Cypr. epiſt. 6. & 14, & 31. & 53. & 72. & 75. Concil. Ancyr. Gangr. Antioch. Laodic. &c.

(h) Barthol. Carranza, Summa Concil. p. 23. &c.

(i) Magdeb. Cent. 4. c. 3. col. 111. & c. 6. col. 463

D. *Whitaker* in his diſputation againſt Bellarmine touching Councels layes downe this Text, *Act.* 15.6. for a ground of that which he takes occaſion to intreat of, and (k) often repeats that text, applying it to each of the queſtions which he diſcuſſeth. And whereas our Oppoſites doe grant a lawfull uſe of Synods for counſell, but not to judge, nor to give judiciall ſentence for the deciding of cauſes; D. Whitak. deſcribing the State of the Queſtion betwixt us and the Papiſts, touching the perſons that are to be called to a Synod, ſhewes that (l) the Papiſts will have onely the Biſhops or greater Prelates, to be allowed for judges, and

(k) De Concil. Qu. 1. c. 1. p. 1, 3, 4, &c.

(l) Ibid. qu. 3. c. 1. p. 79.

and the Presbyters or inferiour Clergie to be onely inquisitors, disputers or consulters, to give counsell, but not to have suffrages in giving definitive sentences. This is the opinion of the (m) Romish Church. Now D. Whit. in the refutation of the Papists, doth as wel refute the Browniſts and other oppoſites, while he proves (n) that all who have a lawfull deputation and calling are to be allowed for judges, and not for counsellers onely; and that their suffrage is not onely for consultation but for decision, as is hereafter shewed more at large. Observe onely at this time, that the first argument in that dispute is taken from this very place, *Act.* 15.

(m) Bellar. Tom. 2. Contr. 1. de Concil. l. 1. c. 15.

(n) De Concil. qu. 3. c. 3

G. Bucerus pleads from this same ground of Scripture, and writes (o) that *not onely severall particular Churches had their proper distinct Presbyteries, but* that *the history of the Apostles witnesseth, that when greater controversies did arise which could not be ended in lesser Colleges, then more Churches under the new Testament did runne unto a Generall Synod. Act.* 15. And what power they were wont to exercise therein, he shewes by a distinction of persons comming to the Synod. As *D. Whit.* refuting the popish distinction of greater and lesser Clergie, shewes that there was a right and power of suffrages & judgement in the Synod: so Bucerus (p) confirming the distinction of Iunius, viz. that some persons came to the Synods as Delegates sent from the Churches, which therefore did give definitive sentence of matters propounded; that others comming without such deputation and commission, might give their advise and counsell but without suffrages, doth hereby acknowledge a power of jurisdiction in the Synod, by those that were peculiarly called to be judges therein.

(o) Differt. de Gub. Ecc. p. 65.

(p) Ibid. p. 107, 108, &c.

Zepperus (q) alledging *Act.* 15. for a patterne of Synods, declares that after the Apostles the primitive Church in the new Testament being *most studious of this consociation* or combination in Synods, did not onely communicate by letters, but meeting together in Nationall or Generall Councels, did heare the causes of Hereticks & others that appeared before them, & so *convinced, condemned and excommunicated them, & sent their decrees unto all Churches with the names & heresies of those that were excommunicate, &c.* Thus did he acknowledge the right of Synods, not onely for counsell & admonition, but also for jurisdiction in censuring.

(q) Polit. Eccl. l. 3. c. 8. de Syn. p. 713. 714, 715, &c.

Piscator (r) writing of Councels and Synods, and of the seven questions concerning them, doth seven times alledge this place, *Act.* 15. for a ground of direction in each of them. And for the authority of Synods, he plainly expresseth his meaning, when speaking of the government of the Church in generall, he sayth * *it consisteth chiefly in Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction*: and againe distinguishing this jurisdiction into two parts, he sayth that the one part consisteth in the power of making lawes, & *potissimum spectatur in Conciliis*, that is, *it is chiefly seen in Synods*.

(r) Thes. Theolog. vol. 1. Loc. 23. p. 361-364. * Thes. 62, 63.

Bucanus (s) writes much to the same purpose, and ascribeth unto Synods authority of making lawes, of deciding controversies, and this from the example of that Synod, *Act.* 15. often mentioned by him.

(s) Loc. Cō. Loc. 43. qu. 21, 22, 25, 27.

Mr Fenner (t) briefly and methodically describing the nature of Synods, the kindes, the use & authority of them, doth derive their authority from this ground,

(t) S. Theol. l. 7. c. 7. p. 278-281.

Act. 15. which even in that ſhort deſcription is more then tenne times alledged by him.

Many other ſuch Teſtimonies might be produced to ſhew the conſent of judicious and learned Divines in this poynt, of which ſomewhat more is to be ſayd, when I come to give anſwer touching that multitude of Authors which Mr Canne alledgeth againſt me. Let us now heare what my Oppoſites ſay concerning this Example.

Mr Dav. his Exceptions touching Act. 15. anſwered.

* Apol reply. p. 254. 255. I. DAV. * *This Text, Act. 15. is alledged by Bellarmine to prove the binding force of the decrees of Councills, and by the Anſwerer, to ſhew the authority of the Claſſis: whereunto Iunius giveth 2 anſwers alſo.* 1. Non ſequitur ex particulari, ſi cuſtodienda fuerint decreta Concilii Apoſtolici, ergo & omnium ſervari oportere. *It doeth not follow from a particular, that becauſe the decrees of an Apoſtolicall Councill are to be obſerved, therefore the decrees of all Councills muſt be ſo kept.*

Contr. 3. li. 4. cap. 16. *And whereas Bellarmine affirmeth that the queſtion there was not defined by Scripture, but by the voyces of the Apoſtles, Iunius denyeth that any thing was ordained in that Councill, but from the Scriptures, as he had before demonſtrated, and thereunto referreth the Reader.* ANSVV. 1. It may be obſerved here

(v) Pref. to the Reader. how untrue it is which Mr Dav. pretends in excuſe of his large writing, ſaying, (v) *For the help of the Reader in comparing the Reply with the Anſwer, I have inſerted his owne words every where.* This hath he not done here, nor in many other places. I ſhew-

(x) Anſw. to unj. cõpl. p. 88. ed (x) how this place *Act.* 15. had bene alledged by another againſt the Browniſts, and that this his allegation ſerved to condemne both himſelf and his fellowes. Mr D. hath neither inſerted mine owne words, nor yet the words of him that had alledged this place. II. In alledging the two anſwers of Iunius unto Bellarmine, he wanders wide from the queſtion in hand. I am of the ſame minde with Iunius in both thoſe anſwers: Though the decrees of that Apoſtolicall Synod were infallibly true and juſt; yet is it not ſo with other Synods, many whereof are to be rejected for their erroneous and unjuſt decrees. All the decrees in that Synod, *Act.* 15. were grounded upon the Scriptures, and reſted not merely upon the ſuffrages of men. Iunius had juſt cauſe ſo to anſwer Bellarmine, that maintained an unlawfull and abſolute authority of Synods, and exacted obedience of neceſſity to all their decrees. Is not this to abuſe both me and his Readers, and to bleare their eyes, that they ſhould not rightly diſcerne the ſtate of the queſtion? III. That the Reader may better conceive in what manner an authority and power is aſſcribed to Claſſes and Synods, let the authority of particular Churches be conſidered, as an example and modell of that authority which is in Synods. My oppoſites themſelves confeſſe that there is in particular Congregations an authority and power to judge and cenſure offendours, and yet they will not deny but that they may erre in their judgements, that they want ſuch infallible direction as the Apoſtles had, and that their decrees and Eccleſiaſticall cenſures are to be regarded no further then they are grounded upon the Scriptures. So is it with the authority of Claſſes & Synods.

(y) Apol. reply. p. 255. I. DAV. (y) *And, whereas Bellarmine ſayth that the decree of the Apoſtles was not left to the examination of the Diſciples, but that they were ſimply commanded to obey, Iunius chargeth*

geth him with falsely supposing two things. 1. That the Apostles alone made this order. *For the Elders concurred with the Apostles in this sentence, and the whole Church, all of them being taught by the spirit of truth to think the same thing.* And this *he saith* is the manner of proceeding in those Councills where Christ is præsident. 2. *That the same respect is to be had to the determination of others, as of the Apostles. Which is an errour, he sayth, For it was the singular priviledge of the Apostles, that they had immediate assistance of the Holy Ghost, and infallibility in their Apostolicall determinations. So that what they delivered was to be received without examination, whereas the dictates and sentences of all other are to be examined by their writings: whereby it appeareth that the Scripture acknowledgeth no such power of making lawes to be due to the Classes, unlesse they can produce some other texts, which when they shall be alledged, shall be further examined, if God permit.* ANSVV. 1. All that Mr Davenp. hath here set downe is wholy impertinent, and all being granted, our assertion touching the lawfull authority of Synods & Classes remaineth firme. We grant with Iunius, (z) that the Apostles alone did not judge, but the Elders and others also concurred with them, not onely in counsell, but in giving judiciall sentence with them. We grant that there is not the like respect to be had to the determinations of others, as of the Apostles: we grant that *no such power* of making lawes is due to Classes, that is, *no such* power of infallible determinations, &c. and yet we hold they have a lawfull authority of judging and deciding controversies, &c. The like we hold concerning particular Churches with their Elderships; we grant they have *no such* power of infallible determinations, and yet a lawfull power to determine and judge of causes: We grant that there is not the like respect to be had to the determinations of particular Churches, as of the Apostles; and yet a due respect not onely for admonition and counsell, but also for power to censure and to give sentence. We grant that the censures, sentences and judgements as well of Elderships and Churches, as of Synods and Classes, are in like manner to be tryed and examined by the Scriptures, and yet this grant impeacheth not the lawfull authority of either of them, in exercising a power of judgement. 11. For the better direction how to discerne & judge of the actions of the Apostles, and how farre their example is a rule of practise and imitation to the Church of God, it shall not be amisse to set downe a profitable and usefull distinction observed by Iunius, (a) which is, that *the Apostles had a twofold manner of Power, Common and Proper. The Common is that ordinary power which they had together with the Elders, as they were Bishops. The Proper or peculiar is that extraordinary power which was for a while given unto the Evangelicall Church at the springing up thereof, in respect of which the Apostles were above the whole Church. According to that common power, Peter was* συμπρεσβύτερος, *a fellow Elder, 1. Pet. 5. 1. according to this peculiar power he destroyed Ananias and Sapphira, Act. 5. By that common power Paul sayth, 1. Cor. 5. 4. You and my spirit being gathered together in the name of our Lord Iesus Christ: but by that peculiar power he sayth, what will you? shall I come unto you with a rod? &c. 1. Cor. 4. 20.* This he sets downe elsewhere more fully, and applyes it to the power exercised *Act. 15.* saying, (b) *Here the Apostles are sayd to have used communication: therefore this power was common to the Church, and not a peculiar action of the Apostles in this Synod at Ierusalem. We doe therefore thus determine distinctly concerning*

(z) Anim. adv. in Bellarm. Contro. 4. l. 1. c. 18. § 11.

(a) Ibid. lib. 2. c. 16. n. 6.

(b) Ibid. l. 1 c. 16. n. 1.

this thing: All that were furnished with gifts and calling judged in this Synod: first the Apostles and Apostolick men: then the Elders that laboured in the ministery of the Word, as well they of the place in Ierusalem, as those of Antioch, & if any moreover were come from other places, &c. Therefore when we alledge this example, *Act.* 15. to shew the authority and power of Synods in judging of controversies, those that to frustrate & elude this example doe plead and except that the Apostles had extraordinary power, they are here reproved by Iunius, who shewes that though the Apostles had extraordinary gifts in judging, which might procure the more respect in that regard; yet the power it self by which they did judge, *Act.* 15. was not extraordinary and peculiar to the Apostles, but ordinary, and common to Ministers, Elders, & other Deputies of the Churches, & therefore commonly & perpetually to be observed & used, as occasion requireth.

Mr Can's Exceptions touching Act. 15. *answered.*

BEfore he comes to the point, he intreats me to resolve five Questions, the two latter whereof I have answered (c) before; the other with their answers are as followeth.

(c) Pag. 34.

I. CAN. 1. (d) *Whither the Assembly, mentioned in Act.* 15. *were a Synod or Classis.* ANSVV. The Assembly mentioned *Act.* 15. was a Synod, and not properly a Classis, according to the usuall acception of the word in these places. Classes are Assemblies of Ministers comming often together out of neighbour Churches within a lesser circuit; Synods have a larger extent, comprehend many Classes under them, & come more seldome together.

(d) Churches plea, p. 32, 33.

I. CAN. II. *How it can be manifested from that place, that both are divine institutions, as here is affirmed.* ANSVV. This place, *Act.* 15. or any other that yeelds warrant for one of these Assemblies, yeelds it for both: because both are of like nature, and differ not essentially, but in circumstantiall matters of time, place, number of persons. In both these is a superiour Ecclesiasticall authority over particular Churches: in respect of both there appeareth a mutuall dependence of Churches, & that all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction is not limited unto a particular Church, which is the Question betwixt us.

I. CAN. III. *How he can naturally from thence rayse this doctrine; viz. Excommunications and elections of Ministers, are actions belonging unto Classes and Synods.* ANSVV. When I rayse such a doctrine from *Act.* 15. as he mentions, which I have not done any where, then is it time for me to manifest how the same ariseth naturally from the Text. Election of Ministers is an action belonging to severall Congregations, and not to Classes and Synods: but if any particular Churches doe offend in chooſing unlawfull and unfit persons, then are Classes and Synods to judge thereof, and to hinder such elections. Had the Church of Antioch gone about to elect for a Minister among them one of that Sect which taught the brethren there, *Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved*; *Act.* 15. 1. 5. then had the Synod at Ierusalem authority to have hindred that election, which appeareth because they had power to make a decree against such false doctrine. *Act.* 15. 28. And thence also it followeth, that if any of the Christian Pharisees had stood obstinately in such errours, tending to the *subversion of soules*, to the bringing

ging in of *another Gospel*, and making *Christ become of no effect* unto men, Act. 15.24. Gal. 1.6,7. & 5.2,3,4. then after due conviction, that Synod at Ierusalem had authority as well to censure the person, as to condemne his errour, having in readines a revenge against all disobedience, 2. Cor. 10.6. *with* Gal. 1. 8,9. especially if the particular Church whereof such a person was a member, should refuse to doe the same according to their direction.

I. CAN. *To the point now: I doe deny that this place Act. 15. proveth any such thing, for which it is alledged. For I. Here was no combination of many Ministers of divers Churches; but onely a few messengers sent from* Antiochia *unto the Congregation at* Ierusalem, *about a controversy there specifyed. Hence it is affirmed by many learned men* (e) *that as* this was an assembly of one onely particular Church; so it binds (f) onely but in a speciall or particular meeting. ANSVV. 1. It is untrue which he sayth, that *here was no combination of many Ministers of divers Churches*; because here were the Ministers of all Churches, even the Apostles that had the care of all the Churches, of whom all Churches might say, these are our Ministers. Act. 15. 6. 2. Cor. 11. 28. 1. Cor. 3. 21,22. Mat. 28. 19. This was the noblest combination of Ministers that ever was. II. It is without warrant that he saith, *onely a few messengers were sent from Antiochia*, for besides Paul and Barnabas, the deputies and messengers of that Church, which might stand for many other, it is sayd, that *certaine other of them* were sent, Act. 15.2. but how many or how few it is not specifyed. III. That which he alledgeth from D. Bridges is unsound, viz. that *this was an Assembly of one onely particular Church*. As it is expressely against the text, so I may oppose against it the testimony of Iunius * before noted, who speaking of them that *judged in this Synod*, reckons up *first the Apostles and Apostolick men; then the Elders that laboured in the ministery of the Word, as well them of the place in* Ierusalem, *as those of* Antioch, *and if any moreover were come from other places, &c.* IV. Whereas he citeth D. Whitaker, as if he affirmed of this Synod at Ierusalem, that *it bindes onely but in a speciall or particular meeting*, he doth herein falsify the testimony of D. Whitak. for though he distinguishing Synods into Particular, Provinciall or Nationall, & Universall, doth in (g) that place, call this a *Particular* Synod, yet hath he no such assertion as though it should *binde onely in a speciall or particular meeting*; and it had bene against the text, Act. 15.23. & 16.4. where it is noted that the Synodicall Epistle was sent unto the Churches of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria & Cilicia, that they might observe the decrees thereof. As for that (h) other place out of D. Whit. it is misalledged, there being no such matter at all there mentioned. Instead of that mistaken place, let him consider what Mr Cartwright saith hereof, (i) *We will not strive whether the Councell were Generall or Provinciall: but it may be counted a Generall Councell in respect of the presence of the Apostles, which were Governours of all the Churches of the world.*

(e) D. Brid. pag. 1224.
(f) D. Whit. de Conc. qu. 2. p. 6. & 67
* Pag. 68.
(g) De Council Qu. 1. c. 2. p. 6.
(h) Ibid. p. 67.
(i) Confut. of Rhem. Annot. on Act. 15. 6.

I. CAN. II. *As Mr Cartwright saith*, (k) Paul and Barnabas went not up to Ierusalem, to submit their judgement to the judgement of the Apostles; for that had diminished the authoritie of their doctrine, then which there was no greater in the world: they being both infallibly directed by the Holy Ghost. Onely they went up to conferre with them, and for countenance of the truth, in respect

(k) Refut. of Rhem. on the place.

of men, and for the ſtopping of the mouthes of ſuch deceivers, as pretended they were ſent by the Apoſtles. *verſ.* 24. *In a word that no ſuſpicion might remaine in the minds of the people, as if Paul in doctrine differed from the reſt.* ANSVV. I. Mr Canne corrupteth and falſifyeth the words of Mr Cartwright, by adding unto them this word *Onely*. Though Paul and Barnabas went up to conferre, yet the words of Mr Cartw. are not, *Onely they went up to conferre*, as here they are alledged. Againe, thoſe words that follow, which Mr Canne ſets downe in ſuch a letter as if Mr Cartw. had ſpoken word for word in ſuch manner, viz. *for countenance of the trueth in reſpect of men, and for the ſtopping of the mouthes of ſuch deceivers as pretended they were ſent by the Apoſtles*, v. 24. theſe are the words of Mr Robinſon (l) verbatim, & taken out of his writing, and therefore ought rather to have bene alledged in his name, then in Mr Cartwrights. II. Though Paul and Barnabas went up for ſuch ends as are here propounded, *for countenancing of the trueth, &c.* yet thoſe ends doe not argue that therefore the Synod at Ieruſalem did not exerciſe Eccleſiaſticall authority in giving definitive ſentence touching the controverſy brought unto them; ſeeing thoſe ends were more effectually and fully obtained thereby. for by ſuch judiciall ſentence the truth was countenanced before men, and the mouthes of deceyvers more effectually ſtopped, and ſuſpicion of difference betwixt the Apoſtles more clearly taken away. III. Though Paul and Barnabas went not up *to ſubmit their judgement to the judgement of the Apoſtles*; yet this hinders not their going to procure that the judgement of thoſe deceyvers, which had troubled the Church of Antioch, and likewiſe that the judgement of ſuch as had bene made to doubt by them might be ſubmitted unto the judgement of the Apoſtles, or that thoſe deceyvers might be cenſured by the Synod, if after conviction they ſhould perſiſt in their evill. IV. That which Mr Cartw. ſpeakes of P. and Barn. not ſubmitting their judgement unto the judgement of the Apoſtles, as if it would have diminiſhed the authority of their doctrine, &c. is to be underſtood (as I conceive) as ſpoken by way of oppoſition to the Rhemiſts and other Papiſts againſt whom he dealt, who ſay as well concerning Paul and Barnabas, as concerning the other deceivers, (m) that they *did not ſtand ſtifly to their owne opinion on either ſide, but condeſcended to referre the whole controverſy and the determination thereof to the Apoſtles, Prieſts or Ancients, &c.* who hold from Jerome that (n) *Paul had not had ſecurity of preaching the Goſpel, unles it had bene approved by the ſentence of Peter, and of the reſt that were with him.* Such a ſubmiſſion might have diminiſhed the authority of their doctrine, and therefore is not to be acknowledged. Otherwiſe there was even in the Apoſtles themſelves a lawfull ſubmiſſiõ unto the judgement of the Church. 1. Peter himſelf (as Iunius well (o) obſerves) *judicio Eccleſiæ ſubjicitur, atque ad eam remittitur voce Chriſti jubentis*, Dic Eccleſiæ, *Mat.* 18. *& alibi.* that is, *he was ſubjected unto the judgement of the Church & ſent unto it by the voyce of Chriſt commanding*, Tell the Church, *Mat.* 18. *& elſwhere.* D. Whitaker alſo (p) affirmes and confirmes the ſame thing concerning Peter: and why may it not be ſayd of Paul and Barnabas as well as of him? 2. Seeing Paul and Barnabas were certaine that the Apoſtles did agree with them in judgement and could not erre in their ſentence, they knew that the ſame ſhould not diminiſh the authority of their doctrine, but rather mag-

(l) Iuſtif. of Separ. p. 199.

(m) Rhem. in Act. 15. 2

(n) Rainol. Conf. with Hart. c. 4. div. 3. p. 133

(o) Anim. adv. in Bell. de Concil. l. 2. c. 16. § 5.

(p) Contro. de Concil. Qu. 5. c. 3. pl. 172.

magnify and illuſtrate the ſame.

I. CAN. III. *If Ieruſalem lay northward 200 miles from Antioch, as I read* (q) *it did: Surely then he hath ſmall reaſon to bring this Scripture, as the ground and foundation of the Claſſicall Aſſembly; yea and to tell us* * *that it is* a remarkable place of Scripture, to warrant the exerciſe of that power which we deny. *And a little after*, This one allegation is ſufficient to evince the falſhood of their aſſertion. ANSVV. I. He miſtakes and ſo perverts the teſtimony of the Author whom he alledgeth, directly contrary to his expreſſe words, who (r) in divers places of this book, as is to be ſeen in the ſeverall editions, ſayth not as it is alledged, that *Ieruſalem lay Northward from Antioch*, but on the contrary that *Antioch lay Northward from Ieruſalem*. So uncircumſpect is he in his quotations. II. Suppoſe it had bene written in his Author ſo as he alledgeth it, yet then it was a great ſimplicity and want of judgement in him, that could not of himſelf have corrected ſuch a manifeſt and palpable errour. Had he had a very ſmall meaſure of knowledge in the Geographicall deſcriptions of the holy Land and the countries bordering thereupon, without the knowledge whereof men cannot well underſtand the ſtory of the Bible, there being ſo many references which the H. Ghoſt hath unto the different ſituation of ſeverall places, then might he have knowne that Ieruſalem lay Southward and Antioch Northward from Ieruſalem. for 1. The common Geographers, (ſ) old and new, of all ſorts, doe beare witneſſe hereof in their Mappes and ordinary deſcriptions of the world and thoſe parts thereof. 2. Had he gone no further but looked well on this ſtory, *Act.* 15. where the meſſengers travelling from Antioch to Ieruſalem, are ſayd in their way to paſſe through *Phœnice* and *Samaria*, he might have obſerved that as thoſe countries in the way lay Northward from Ieruſalem, ſo muſt Antioch alſo from whence in the right way they came to thoſe countries. Let others be admoniſhed hereby, that they raſhly follow not ſuch a guide, that will be a great maſter and teacher of the Churches, and yet as the wiſe man noteth, knowes not the way to the City. *Eccleſ.* 10. 15. III. I doe willingly grant that Antioch was 200 miles from Ieruſalem: thoſe 70 Dutch miles which this Authour mentions, according to common account make 280 Engliſh miles, 80 more then Mr Canne reckons. Now the further that Antioch was from Ieruſalem, the ſtronger is this our Argument from *Act.* 15. The greater paines they tooke in travell, to come unto another ſuperiour judicatory out of themſelves, doth argue the greater neceſſity of Synods, and ſhewes that the fruit expected thereby was the more precious in their eyes. The Deputies of the Churches that came to the late Synod at Dort, from Geneva, Zurich and Berne, travelled further then theſe Antiochians did. And of old time they came more then twiſe ſo farre unto Synods. Had this combination of Churches and their authority in judging brought the Churches into *Antichriſtian bondage*, as the Browniſts call it, then might it have bene ſayd unto all theſe travellers, as once unto the Idolatrous Jewes, *O ye ſwift dromedaries, &c. keep your feet from barenes and your thoat from thirſt. Ier.* 2. 23. 25. IV. It is to be obſerved how he omitteth the things that were ſpecially intended by me, for the conviction of thoſe I had to deale with by the teſtimony and reaſoning of one of their owne fellowes. Whereas I grounded my re-

(q) Itiner. N. Teſt. fol. 96.

* Pag. 88.

(r) Itiner. N. T. p. 66. & 82. edit. 1624. & p. 82. & 101. edit. 1635.

(ſ) Cl. Ptol. Aſiæ tab. 4. Atlas Mer. &c.

See before Pag. 32.

reproof of them upon his confession, and the conclusion I made did arise from the premisses of his assertion; this is passed by, so that the Reader cannot understand the force of my reasoning in that place, and yet he cryes out to me, teaching his client to say, *But before you make such hasty conclusions; have a little patience to heare us, to speak for ourselves.* W.B. should rather have sayd, *to heare what a Brownist can say for us*, and how *Mr Canne* can defend the matter. I desire the Reader to look on my (t) first Answer, and then to judge whether that was a *hasty conclusion*, wherein the ancientest of themselves went before me. But let us heare how he proceeds.

(t) Answ. to W.B. p. 87, 88.

I. CAN. (v) *I pray how can you prove that the Officers of these two Churches, being 200 miles asunder, were combined and met ordinarily together (as the Classes doe) to determine the cases of many Churches?* ANSVV. 1. Their combination is manifest in this act of communion and comming together for the judgement and decision of the controversy raised among them. 11. That they met ordinarily together I never sayd, neither doe I affirme it; this being not a Classicall but a Synodall Assembly, according to the common distinction thereof, and according to the practise among us. 111. That they determined the cases of many Churches I shewed * before, from *Act.* 15.23. & 16.4.

(v) Churches plea. p. 34.

* Pag. 69.

I. CAN. *Or how doe you prove that there was any officer at all of Antioch, in Ierusalem at this time?* ANSVV. I prove it, 1. Because Paul and Barnabas were both speciall Deputies of the Church of Antioch, and likewise had such a generall calling as made them Officers of every Church. 11. Because the Apostles which then remained at Ierusalem, as Peter and Iames, were as well Officers of Antioch as of Ierusalem, Apostles being Governours of all Churches. 111. For the other messengers sent from Antioch, seeing Elders are approved by the Church as fittest to mannage the affaires thereof, therefore it was reasonable that at least some of them should be sent about this busines, & thereupon *Iunius* (as is * before noted) takes it for granted, that the Elders of the Church of Antioch were among those that judged in this Synod.

* Pag. 68.

I. CAN. *Briefly, or how doe you proove, that the brethren sent from Antioch exercised authority in the Church at Ierusalem?* ANSVV. That the Deputies sent from Antioch, had authority and power of suffrages in the Synod at Ierusalem, appeareth by the generall and speciall commissions given unto them, as is mentioned in the answer to his former demand. As Paul once answered for himself and for Barnabas upon another occasion, when he was carped at by some in the Church of Corinth: *Or I onely and Barnabas have we not power, &c.* 1. *Cor.* 9.6. so might he have answered for both in this case. for let Mr C. shew if he can what publick Ecclesiasticall meeting could have bene in those times, in any Church, touching any controversy that concerned any generall doctrine of the Gospell, yea or the censure of manners in any other person; wherein Paul and Barnabas might not exercise authority with others.

I. CAN. *Yet all this you must make good, otherwise you are guilty of abusing and perverting the Scripture, in affirming that* the power which the Classis exerciseth, was practised at Antioch and Ierusalem, and by Apostolicall direction. *This you have spoken: but it is untrue. &c.* ANSVV. 1. Suppose I had not made good all that he requi-

required me to proove; ſuppoſe the Church of Ieruſalem alone had judged the controverſy, and that no Officer of the Church of Antioch had bene among them, with any authority: yet this example of one Church judging the controverſy riſen in another, doth ſhew that all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is not limited unto a particular Church within itſelf, but that the cauſes of one Church may be ſubmitted unto the judgement of another. This is the ſubſtance of the Queſtion betwixt us, and this being granted it followes that Churches have liberty to appoint Claſſes and Synods for the mutuall judging of their cauſes, as occaſion ſhall require. 11. By charging me with untrueth in ſuch manner as here he doeth, he makes himſelf guilty of double untrueth: for 1. This affirmation here mentioned was not mine at that time, but his in whoſe name I repeated it, and that with condition, if it were ſo, *If the Churches here doe practiſe, &c.* as may be plainly ſeen in the forementioned place of my Anſwer. 2. Though at that time I intended not to diſpute the cauſe, but firſt waited for the proofes of ſuch as accuſed me; yet had I then uſed ſuch an affirmation, yet it had bene true, as I ſhew throughout this Chapter, and therefore it was an untrueth in Mr Canne to avouch the contrary. And as for that place *Ier. 23. 31.* which he miſapplyeth againſt me, the threatning contained therein is to be feared of him who hereafter abuſeth & perverteth ſo many Scriptures for the ſubverting of Synods.

I. CAN. IIII. *It is certaine, that at Ieruſalem not onely the Apoſtles and Elders met together; but as* Luke *expreſſeth it, verſ. 12,22. the Church alſo; being intereſted in the thing: And therefore gave ſentence with the reſt, to the decree then made. Obſerve what* D. Whitaker *replyes unto Bellarmine, denying the multitude to be called:* It was alwayes *(ſayth hee)* (x) the practiſe of the Apoſtles in common caſes, to call the whole Church together: and no doubt but they did ſo here. Now there was no need to have it mentioned, ſeeing it had bene their conſtant cuſtome formerly ſo to doe. Mr Parker (y) *affirmes the ſame: So the Authours of the Cent.* (z) *And it ſeemes in Cyprians* (a) *time, the Church was not deprived of her right herein; howſoever the Papiſts* (b) *in thoſe dayes teach otherwiſe, and* Mr Paget *and others, doe otherwiſe practiſe.* ANSVV. 1. In that not onely the Apoſtles and Elders, but other brethren alſo *gave ſentence with the reſt to the decree then made*; it followeth hence from the conſideration of that which is here confeſſed to be done by each kinde of perſon here mentioned, that the uſe of Synods is not onely for counſell or admonition, but alſo *to give ſentence and to make decrees*, which are acts of authority and power. The errour of Bellarmine and the Papiſts is (c) that onely *Majores Prælati*, the greater ſort of Prelates (ſuch as are their Biſhops and Archbiſhops, and by priviledge or cuſtome, Cardinals, Abbots, and Generals of Orders) have *jus ſuffragii deciſivi*, that is, *authority to give definitive ſentence*; that Preſbyters, Elders, and other Doctours or learned men in the Synod have onely *ſuffragium conſultivum, a voyce in conſultation*, liberty to give counſell, to deliberate and diſpute, but not to give definitive ſentence in the deciding of any matter. Thus they take away the right and power of judging from one half or more of thoſe perſons that are to appeare in Synods. The errour of the Browniſts and other our Oppoſites is that all the perſons in the Synod have onely *ſuffragium conſultivum*, onely power to deliberate, to adviſe and give counſell

(x) De Cle. Qu. 8. c. 3. & Qu. 3. c. 3. p. 96, 97.
(y) Polit. Eccl. l. 3. c. 12. p. 108, 126, 334.
(z) Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 9. p. 547, 548.
(a) Lib. 4. Epiſt. 16.
(b) Bellarm. de Conc. & Eccl. l. 1. c. 16. p. 39.
(c) De Concil. l. 1. c. 15. & 16.

fell, that all jurisdiction is limited unto a particular Church: and so they destroy wholly the authority of Synods, which the Papists doe in part. The Papists deprive one half of the persons of their power, and these deprive all the persons of their power. But now in this case Mr Canne by his confession refutes both these errours, granting jurisdiction, a power of *giving sentence and making decrees* unto the people as well as others. Thus is he condemned out of his owne mouth. Thus is he condemned by those whom he alledgeth: when D. Whitaker sayth of Act. 15. (d) *In hoc ergo Concilio quivis laicus & Presbyter definitivum suffragium habuit, non minus quam Petrus*; that is, *In this Synod every lay-man and Elder had a definitive voyce, as well as Peter.* Thence it followes that there was an authority and jurisdiction in the Synod: it was not onely for advise and counsell. He saith againe, (e) *The end of Synods is to decide controversies, to prescribe Canons, to correct abuses, to set Churches in order, &c.* What plainer evidence of their power can we seek for? This same authority of Synods is in like manner proved by that which (f) Mr Parker to like purpose witnesseth together with D. Whitak. and others. 11. Mr Canne here doth yet blame our practise in depriving the Church of her right, and the people of their interest, and is so eager in seeking to blame the manner of our keeping Synods, that unawares he hath yeelded us the matter itself about which we dispute, viz. an authority of giving sentence, and not onely a giving of counsell by Synods. His reprehension is that *Mr Paget and others doe otherwise practise.* But who be those *others* beside me? Why did he not name them as well as me? Are they any *other* then all the knowne Reformed and Orthodox Churches in Europe? He might well think that if he had mentioned these, the very naming of them and my following of their practise, would have bene not so great a blame unto me, as an occasion of making himself suspected and condemned for his unjust opposing of them. That it may the better appeare how unjustly he blameth our practise, let us examine more particularly what he hath sayd, and withall set downe some observations, whereby the peoples right in Synods may the better be discerned.

(d) DeCõc. qu.3.c.3.p. 97.

(e) Ibid.c. 2.p.85.

(f) Pol.Eccl. lib.3.p.108 126,334.

I. To shew the peoples interest, he alledgeth *Act.* 15. 12, 22. where there is mention made of *the multitude* that was present, and of *the whole Church* sending messengers, &c. But by *the multitude* we may understand not the whole number of the Church at Ierusalem, which consisted of many thousands, but rather the multitude of such speciall persons as were met in the Synod. So *Beza* interpreteth it, (g) *Multitudinis autem nomine intelligenon totam Ecclesiam, &c. By the name of the multitude understand not the whole Church, which was not yet wholy adjoyned, but the whole company of the Apostles and Elders, as appeareth before from the 6 verse, &c. Piscator* likewise (h) approves this interpretation, and addes some further light unto it, from the reference of the Greek article, though he also give liberty for another interpretation. So for that phrase, *the whole Church*, mentioned *vers.* 22. *Iunius* (i) expounds the same of the Elders and Deacons, or the whole *Clerus* or Clergy serving that Church: *these saith he are designed by the common name of the Church. Calvine* also (k) writes to the same purpose, *Luke saith not that the whole Church was gathered together, but those that were men of learning and judgement, and which by vertue of their office were lawfull judges of this cause. It may be indeed that the disputation was before the people, but*

(g) Annot. maj. in N.T. in Act. 15. 12.

(h) Schol. in Act. 15. 12.

(i) Animad. in Contr. 4. de Conc. l. 1. c. 15. n. 19. & c. 16. n. 1.

(k) Cõmen. in Act. 15. 6

but leſt any man ſhould think that the common people were promiſcuouſly admitted to handle the cauſe, Luke expreſſely nameth the Apoſtles and Elders, as more fit to take cognition thereof.

II. We grant that beſides Miniſters and Elders, other members of the Church may have ſuffrages or voyces, and give ſentence in Synods as well as thoſe that are Officers; alwayes provided, that they be lawfully deputed and ſent thereunto. Thus *D. Whitaker* explaines himſelf touching his allowance of lay-men to have voyces in Synods, and ſayth, (l) *Every man ought not to be admitted into the Synod nor to ſpeak therein. but he that ſhall be choſen of the Church and deſigned thereunto.* Againe he ſaith, (m) *Not onely Biſhops are to be choſen of the Church to be ſent unto Synods, but other godly, prudent, & learned men, which happily can diſpute more ſkilfully, and inquire into controverſies better then the Biſhops. Whoſoever is ſent of the Church he repreſents the Church.* And ſo (n) oft in other places. *Iunius* in like manner (o) requires of ſuch as have voyce in Synods that they be *furniſhed with gifts and calling*, whether Officers or any others. And this alſo is the practiſe of the Reformed Churches in theſe parts, where upon occaſion divers times ſome ſuch are deputed and ſent unto Synods, which have no Eccleſiaſticall office: and even in the Nationall Synod at Dort divers other members of the Church, which were neither Miniſters nor Elders, were ſent thither & allowed to be Delegates, & were to have not onely deliberative but alſo definitive voyces, as well as any other; as appeares (p) in the lawes & orders preſcribed by the Illuſtrious LL. the States Generall, &c.

(l) De Conc. qu. 3. c. 2. p. 92.
(m) Ibid. c. 3. p. 103.
(n) p. 97. 98. 104.
(o) Anim. adv. de Cõc. l. 1. c. 15. n. 4. & c. 16. n 1, & n, 10.
(p) Act. Synod. Nat. Dordr. Seſſ. 4. Art. 3.

III. Even of thoſe which by a lawfull election & deputation are ſent unto Synods, whether they be Miniſters and Elders, or other members of the Church, there ought to be a limited and certaine number: for if every Church in a whole nation might ſend as many as they would or could; there might be thouſands and ten thouſands gathered together into ſome Synods, whereby great confuſion and diſorder in the diſcuſſing and judging of many cauſes would apparently follow. D. Whitaker ſaith, (q) *Certainly confuſion cannot be avoyded, when too many meet together:* And as for that Synod at Ieruſalem, he ſaith, * *That aſſembly could not be great, becauſe they were compaſſed about with the Prieſts and Phariſees.* And therefore alſo in the practiſe of theſe Churches there is a certaine number determined, of ſuch as are to be ſent unto Synods, as appeareth likewiſe in (r) thoſe lawes before mentioned. If Mr Canne will allow any limitation of number, and can therein ſatiſfy himſelf, that he doth not deprive the people & Churches of their right, he may thereby alſo ſatiſfy himſelf for any thing that he objecteth unto us in this behalf.

(q) De Cõc. q. 3. p. 81.
* Ibid. q. 1. c. 6.
(r) Act. Synod. Nat. Dordr. Seſſ. 4. Art. 3.

IV. We doe further grant this liberty, even unto ſuch as are no Delegates or Deputies of the Church, that though they be not allowed for judges, yet many of them (ſ) as hearers may for their edification be preſent at the comunication & conference in the Synod, that they may profit in godlines. This alſo is the practiſe of theſe Churches, both in Provinciall and Nationall Synods, ſo farre as the place will conveniently receive a competent number: and ſo alſo it was obſerved in the Nationall Synod at Dort.

(s) Inn. Animadv. in Bell. de Concil. l. 1. c. 15. n. 2, 3. & 9.

V. This liberty of hearing in Synods is ſo moderated & reſtrained, that though they which have no calling unto the Synod, may heare queſtions touching doc-

trine and religion discussed, yet such are not allowed to be present and to heare when personall matters of scandall and offence come to be examined, because as *Lyranus* saith, (t) *contra charitatem fuisset. Nam veritatis cognitio ad omnes pertinet, infirmitatum minime.* that is, *It had bene against charity: for the knowledge of the trueth belongs unto all: the knowledge of infirmities not so.*

(t) Ibid. c. 15. n. 9.

VI. Touching the right and liberty of Synods there are many other things to be further observed. When *Mr Cartwright* had spoken very much for the liberty of the people in Synods, yet for prevention of mistaking, and by way of correcting himself after a sort he saith, (v) Yet write we not this, as though the peoples presence, either in all Councels where the doctrine is not in controversy, were * needfull: or that in those Councels where they were present, they have like right with those Bishops and Elders. For they (we mean Bishops and Elders) may first by a severall and foreset deliberation, take counsell whether it be expedient to propound any such matter, as is in cõtroversie in that Councell where the people shall be present. Whereby if they perceive any generall and obstinate opposition of them against the truth, they may hold that poynt of doctrine back. This we see to have been done by *Iosias*, who or ever he assembled the people, first of all assembled the Elders of Iuda and Ierusalem. 2. *King.* 23. 1. Also by *Iames*, who at *Pauls* arrivall to Ierusalem, first assembled the Elders to debate of the matter, or ever he was presented before the Church. *Act.* 21. 18, 19. Secondly, if the people should bewray a wilfull stubbornesse against the truth, not suspected by them: yet the Governours being sound (without whom there can nothing be concluded) there should not follow any prejudice of the Councels authority against the trueth: albeit the number of the people assembled were greater then of those Bishops and Elders. Hereupon it commeth that the Decrees of the Councell are after called the Decrees of the Apostles & Elders; leaving out the brethren, which *Luke* had first set downe. And upon the same ground in the decision of doubtfull matters, *Moses*, *Deut.* 17. commandeth that they should have recourse unto the *Priests of the Leviticall stocke*, for that they bare the principall sway in those deliberations. Lastly, the case of Councels being as it hath bene declared, it is no marvell although *Augustine* call a Generall Councell in some respect, *the consent of the whole Church*, considering that not onely those Bishops and Elders, but some of the people were (in all likelyhood) there assembled.

(v) Confut. of the Rhemists Ann. on Act. 15. v. 6. n. 5. * The negative particle added there, seemes to be the Printers fault, being contrary to that which went before and followes after, making no good sense in his words, & is therefore to be omitted.

That which *Mr Cartw.* sayth of the *severall and foreset deliberation*, agreeth with that which *Beza* (x) writes of a Προσβολὴ βουλῆς, or foregoing consultation. The same is acknowledged by (y) *Mr Fenner* also. And hereunto accordeth that which *Gerson Bucerus* fitly noteth concerning the meaning of *Cyprian*, who writing unto the Elders & Deacons that he had determined from the beginning of his government to doe nothing by his owne judgement privately, (z) *without their counsell, and without consent of the people*; Bucerus explaineth his speech distinctly, on this manner (a) *Behold, first he mentions the counsell which was to be borrowed from the Presbytery: and then the consent, whereby the judgement of the Presbytery was publickly approved of the people.* And this he applyes also to the order of that judgement described, 1. *Cor.*

(x) Ann. in Act. 15. 12.
(y) S. Theo. l. 7. p. 277.
(z) Cyprian. l. 3. ep. 10.
(a) Differt. de Gub. Eccles. p. 145.

5. Bur

5. But concerning the judgement of Cyprian we have occasion to speak more hereafter.

I. CAN. V. *Howsoever the Church at Antioch, sent some Brethren, with Paul and Barnabas, unto the Church at Ierusalem: notwithstanding (and let it be well observed) they did not this as being* a dependent body, and standing under another Ecclesiasticall authoritie out of themselves. *For as* Mr Parker (b) *excellently proves it, the Church at Antioch at this time, had absolute power in, and for her self, to have ended the controversy; and might have done it: I say, in respect of authority, without acquainting therewith any other Congregation at all. To the same purpose another saith,* (c) The Church of Antioch sent not to Ierusalem, as being bound in duety thereto: But in regard it was the chief place of Religion, therefore they made choyse freely of that Congregation, as knowing them to be best able to resolve the controversie. *True it is, the* Hierarchie (d) *deny this: of whose opinion* Mr Paget *must either be; or els the Classes, (as they now rule) must fall to the ground; for any relief that this Scripture, Act. 15. will yeeld unto them.* ANSVV. 1. Had Mr Canne well understood the state of the question, or what he saith and whereof he affirmes, he might easily have knowne that we are of the same minde with *Mr Parker*, in this, that as Antioch so every other particular Church hath like authority to end their owne controversies, if they finde themselves able. This condition, concealed by Mr Canne, is foure or five times repeated by *Mr Parker* in the (e) place alledged, speaking of Antioch and other particular Churches with these expresse words, *si modo posset, si modo vires suppetivissent, &c. if they could; if they had ability; if they found not themselves too weak; in case of impotency, &c.* Mr Canne hiding these conditions from the eyes of his Readers, doth hereby hood-wink them and keeps them in darknes from seeing the right meaning of *Mr Parker*. 11. Besides the case of impotency alledged by *Mr Parker*, there was another reason why this controversy at Antioch was to be brought unto a Synod, viz. because it was *causa communis*, a common cause, that concerned both many other Churches in regard of the matter, and in speciall the Church of Ierusalem, because the authours of this controversy were not members of the Church of Antioch, but came from Iudæa and from them of Ierusalem, *Act.* 15. 1,24. and therefore that Church of Ierusalem had more right and authority to judge of them, then they of Antioch had. 111. Whereas he would have it to be well observed, that the Church of Antioch sent to them of Ierusalem, *not as being a dependent body, standing under another Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves:* the right and well observing hereof stands in this, that we acknowledge particular Churches to be dependent bodies, not by way of subjection unto any one supposed to have more authority then the rest, but so dependent that every one is equally and mutually subject to one another, as occasion requireth. The Churches of Ierusalem, of Antioch, of Samaria, and others, were all of equall authority, and yet each standing under the authority of a Synod compounded of them all: and this appeareth by the instance of this controversy, referred here to the decision of the Synod at Ierusalem. 1v. For the testimony of *D. Whitaker*, (f) that *the Church of Antioch sent not to Ierusalem as being bound in duety thereto*: 1. It is misalledged by him, for in the Chapter mentioned by him there are no such words to be found:

(b) Poli. Ec. cl. l. 3. c. 20. p. 301. & 314.
(c) D. Whit. Conc. qu. 1. c. 1.
(d) D. Whit. B. T. C. 3.
(e) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 20. p. 301, 302.
(f) Conc. qu. 1. c. 1.

the words are indeed Mr Parkers, and not of *another* as he sayth, poynting at D. Whit. in his margine. He jumbles testimonies together; that which one sayth, he sets downe in anothers name, and followes the mistake that is in Mr Parkers (g) book through the Printers or Writers fault. And though in the (h) Chapter following D. Whit. sayth of Ierusalem, that there was *as it were a certaine castle of Religion and the head of the Church*; yet the other words are none of his. So licentious and negligent is Mr C. in his quotations. 2. For the thing it self, though in the combination of Churches into Synods, they are not limited and simply bound in duety (*ex obligato*, as Mr Parker sayth) to any one Church more then another, yet this freeth them not from their duety of uniting themselves to some Classes or Synods: even as particular persons though they be not simply bound to one Congregation more then another, but may use a Christian liberty therein; yet are they bound in duety to joyne themselves as members to some Chuch: and further where no absolute necessity is imposed, yet godly wisedome teacheth men a duety in respect of circumstances and accidentall occasions, to make choyse of one Church rather then another. v. He alledgeth D. Whitg. so defectively that no man by his quotation can tell how to finde his words. But whereas he sayth of the Hierarchy, that I must either be of their opinion; *or els the Classes (as they now rule) must fall to the ground; for any relief, &c.* this consequence remaines to be declared and proved by him.

(g) Pa. 314.
(h) De Cõc. Qu. 1. c. 2. p. 6.

I. CAN. VI. *When the* Hierarchie *alledge Act. 15. to proove their Dioceſan and Provinciall Synods lawfull, marke how they are answered by the Reformists*, (i) The particular acts of the Apostles, in cases alike, must alike be observed. *If this reason be effectuall (as indeed it is) against them; then it is no lesse effectuall against the Classes: Now I have in part already shewed, how quite contrary their doings are unto the Example in Act. 15. unto which this further may be added: that the matter carried from* Antioch *to* Ierusalem, *was agreed upon by the whole Church; and sent thither by their mutuall desire and consent: And hence our Divines teach, that* the power of bringing things from one Congregation to another, belongeth not to any one Officer, but to the whole Church. *If this be true, by what word of God then doth* Mr Paget, by his * owne authoritie, and without the consent of the Consistory, or any one of them, *carry matters to the Classis, and there he and they together, undoe all that, which the Elders, with the Churches consent, had before joyntly concluded.* ANSVV. 1. That *the particular acts of the Apostles, in cases alike, must alike be observed*, I doe willingly grant, and thereupon ground our Argument for the authority of Synods. To this end it is alledged of Mr Parker in this very place which Mr C. doth cite, viz. to shew how controversies are to be brought from particular Churches, not to one person, to a Bishop or Arch-Bishop, as the Hierachy would have it, but unto a Synod according to the example in *Act.* 15. How Mr Canne doth imagine that this should be effectuall against Classes, he neither declareth, neither can I conjecture. 11. Whereas he addeth, that *the matter carried from Antioch to Ierusalem was agreed upon by the whole Church, &c.* I argue thence; if a whole Church sometime be so offended and troubled by false teachers, that they hold it needfull to seek help of a Synod; it is lesse marvell that sometimes one or two should be driven to seek such help. Had there bene but one

(i) Park. Polit. Ecc. l. 3. c. 20. p. 315, 316.

Pag. 338.

* Thus he is accused by our Elders, in the records of our Church, Oct. 6. 1631.

one perſon in Antioch troubled and unſatiſfyed in conſcience about that poynt of juſtification and ſalvation by the works of the Law, who could have forbidden him to ſeek help of the Synod, either by way of counſell or judgement, when he could not finde it at home? And in matters of judgement, ſeeing juſtice is to be done to one perſon as well as to a multitude; *Ier.* 21.12. & 22.3. *Eſa.* 58.6. *Amos*, 5.12.24. therefore if one perſon think himſelf oppreſſed by a particular Church, the liberty of appeale is not to be denyed him. III. Whereas they ſay, *Hence our Divines teach, &c.* whom do they meane by this phraſe, *our Divines?* Doth W. B. mean the Arminian Divines, unto whom he hath declined, and is become one of their diſciples? Doth Mr C. mean the Divines of the Separation? The communion of other Divines is renounced by them. And theſe alſo are ſuch, that if a whole Church together ſhould agree to referre their controverſies unto the judgement of a Synod, they hold it to be an Antichriſtian bondage. Doe they mean *Mr Parker* whom they alledged immediately before, and unto whom they ſeem to have reference by that ambiguous quotation, ſo ſet downe in the margine as if it belonged unto that which went before? Yet he is but one, and none of theirs. *Mr Parker* ſaith indeed * there, that *this delegation and power of delegating is not in one Biſhop, but in the Churches themſelves.* He ſpeakes of that communication of Churches, when ſome deale with others concerning any Eccleſiaſticall buſines, by ſending their delegates or meſſengers unto them, which power of ſending delegates in Eccleſiaſticall affaires, he proves to be in the Church it ſelf, and not in any one Biſhop, in oppoſition unto the Hierarchy, who will have ſuch buſineſſes to be done by themſelves and in their owne name. That which Mr Parker ſayth is no way contrary unto the practiſe of the Claſſes and Synods, where the Deputies and Delegates of the Churches appeare in the name of thoſe ſeverall Churches from which they are ſent, acknowledging the power of their delegation to be derived unto them from the ſame. Mr C. and W. B. confound theſe two things which are to be diſtinguiſhed, viz. the dealing in Church affaires in the name of the Church, which they onely are allowed to doe who are choſen of the Church and deſigned thereunto, and the propounding of perſonall grievances in caſe of appeale or complaint touching any thing that is amiſſe, which, as we ſayd before, is free unto every Officer and member of the Church when he cannot otherwiſe be ſatiſfyed, he doing it ſtill in his owne name. Now both theſe may be underſtood by that their phraſe of *bringing things from one Congregation to another:* whereas Mr Parker meant onely the former, as is plaine by his whole diſcourſe in the place mentioned; though Mr C. and W. B. would faine apply it unto the latter, as appeares by the inference which thence they make againſt me. But for this their opinion they cannot ſhew any one word of God, nor any one Divine, whereas I have the * witneſſe of both. IV. Touching the accuſation of me in particular, that I have brought matters to the Claſſis, *without conſent of the Conſiſtory, or any one of them, &c.* how earneſt ſoever they be both in the line and in the margine to load me with double rebuke; yet their owne words fall upon them, and while they ſeek to accuſe, they excuſe me rather. for if it be as they ſay, then it appeares that the matter I took in hand was ſuch as might ſtand

* Pol. Eccl. P. 338.

* Pag. 37. 41.

firme

firme upon tryall and examination by the Deputies, Ministers and Elders of many Churches, when as the contrary proceedings were all undone and came to nothing. And yet it is also false which they say of the *Churches consent*: the matter being never propounded unto the Church, nor their consent required or asked, notwithstanding all that was done by some particular persons. The complaints and reproaches with which they make up their 6 Exception are not worth the answering. The testimony of the *English Church at Franekford* is afterward to be considered.

I. CAN. VII. *The thing then and there concluded, was divine Scripture, imposed upon all other Churches of the Gentiles, although they had no delegates there, v. 22, 28. ch. 16. 4.*

ANSVV. I. The Argument is not taken from the infallibility of trueth that was in the decrees of this Synod, but from the order according to which they were made, and the persons determining the things that were then and there concluded, being such as did not all belong unto that particular Congregation, where the controversy was raysed. II. Though the decrees in that Synod were grounded upon the Scriptures, as I granted * before; yet they could not be sayd to be divine Scripture, untill they were by *Luke* recorded among the *Acts of the Apostles*: neither was it manifest unto all that they were according to the Scriptures, untill it was concluded in the Synod; for els it had bene in vaine to have repaired thither for this resolution. III. He that would seem to say * before out of D. Whit. that this assembly did *binde onely but in a speciall or particular meeting*, doth now acknowledge that the thing then and there concluded did binde *all other Churches of the Gentiles*, being *imposed* upon them all, to be observed by them. It is true indeed that the decrees of this Synod were directed and delivered unto severall Churches of the Gentiles, where the observation of them was judged to be necessary, not onely because they were *by infallible direction from the holy Ghost*, which reason is implyed by Mr Robinson (from whence this and the substance of most of the former exceptions is borrowed) when he addes, (k) *and so imposed upon all other Churches, &c.* but besides, because the Apostles were chief judges in this Synod, who as I have shewed often * before, were as Delegates from all the Churches; in which respect, as was also noted * out of Mr Cartwright, this Synod may be accounted a Generall Councell.

* Pag. 66.

* Pag. 69.

(k) Iustif. of Sep. p. 199.

* Pag. 62, 72.

* Pag. 69.

I. CAN. VIII. *It is observable, how* Mr Paget *stumbleth at the same stone, and misapplyeth the very same place of Scripture, as the Papists* (l) *have done before: For thus they write*; Paul and Barnabas condescended to referre the whole controversie, & the determination thereof, to the Apostles and Ancients at Ierusalem, that is to say, to commit the matter to be tryed by the Heads and Bishops, and their determination in Councill. *And indeed such application of it, better serves the turne of Iesuits and Priests, that seek to set up the* Popes Supremacie, *and a* Tyrannicall Hierarchie, *then those that desire to stand for the* Rights *and* Priviledges, *which Christ hath given unto his Church.*

(l) Rhem. on the place. &c.

ANSVV. There is nothing sayd here, but either it is refuted by that which I have sayd already; or els it is a mere begging of the question, by avouching that which remaines by him to be prooved, and which I am to disprove when I come to the examination of his Arguments. Though the Papists abuse

and

and pervert this place, yet that is no prejudice to our and others right uſe of it, as I ſhewed before * touching the like exception about *Deut.* 17. How can I be ſayd to miſapply this place as the Papiſts have done, ſeeing I doe not apply it in ſuch ſort as they have done, either to derogate from the certainty of the doctrine preached by Paul and Barnabas, which their opinion noted in thoſe very words of the Rhemiſts which he cites, I have * before rejected; or to prove that Councels have abſolute authority, and that their decrees are infallible, which errour of theirs I have in like manner diſclaimed, both in my (m) former writing, and at the very * firſt entrance into this Diſpute? In a word, ſeeing I have applyed this place no otherwiſe, then other Orthodox Divines have done before me, it is needles to inſiſt further upon this matter.

* Pag. 35. 36.

* Pag. 70.

(m) Anſ. to W.B. p. 89.

* Pag. 29. & p. 6, 67.

See before, p. 63, 64, 65.

CHAP. V.

An Anſwer to the Allegations of Mr Davenport, touching the Authority of Synods.

HAving ſearched through Mr Dav. his book for ſome ſpeciall Arguments from the Scripture, to ſhew the undue power of Claſſes and Synods, whereof he with others doth accuſe them, I doe therein finde my ſelf deceived and fruſtrate of my expectation. He ſpeaks oft of the warrant of the word, but he brings it not where and when it moſt concerned him. I finde onely in one piece of a leafe (a) a few teſtimonies of Scripture, but ſo looſely and ambiguouſly noted, without framing any Argument from them or without applying them directly to the Queſtion, that men hardly can gueſſe at his meaning. I finde alſo the moſt of the very ſame teſtimonies firſt alledged by Mr Canne before Mr D. his book came forth, and by him framed into Arguments; and therefore in anſwer to Mr Can. I ſhall ſpeak ſomething of them in the next Chapter. That which he doth moſt largely inſiſt upon, is the writing and teſtimonies of men: and of theſe he ſayth, (b) *I will not ſtand to give a Catalogue of their names, though I might be plentifull therein, but will content my ſelf with the three Writers of this kinde, whom the Anſwerer pretended, in conference with me, to make for him. and I ſhall ſhew them to be ſtrongly againſt him, Mr Cartwright, and Mr Fenner, and Mr Parker, men of our owne nation.*

(a) Apol. reply. p. 236.

(b) Ibid. p. 238.

SECT. I. *His Allegation of Mr Cartwright anſwered.*

FOr *Mr Cartwright*; His owne words undivided are theſe: (c) And if it ſhould ,, happē (which may come to paſſe) that any Church ſhould deſire or chooſe, ,, or conſent upon by the moſt part, ſome that is unmeet, either for doctrine or ,, manners, then the Miniſters and Elders of the other Churches round about, ,, ſhould advertiſe firſt, and afterward as occaſion ſhould ſerve, ſharply & ſeverely ,, charge, that they forbeare ſuch election, or if it be made, that they confirme it ,, not, by ſuffering him to exerciſe any miniſterie. And if either the Churches ,, round about doe faile of this duety, or the Church which is admoniſhed, reſt ,, not in their Admonition, then to bring it to the next Synode, and if it reſt not

(c) T.C. 3 Reply. p. 49 2 edit.

„ therein, then the Prince or Magiſtrate, which muſt ſee that nothing in the „ Churches be diſorderly and wickedly done, ought to drive that Church from „ that election to another which is convenient. Now upon theſe words Mr Dav. without any juſt explication or further declaration thereof, makes this bold and unreaſonable concluſion. (d) *Thus Mr Cartwright. So that in his judgement, other Churches have no power of hindring a faulty election, but by admonition, which power every Chriſtian hath in another, for his good.* But that *Mr Cartw.* giveth more power unto the Churches and Synod, then that which every Chriſtian hath, & more then the power of admonition onely, it appeareth thus:

(d) Apol. reply. p. 47.

I. He doth in this place manifeſtly diſtinguiſh betwixt admonition, & a charge or commandement, which implyes a greater power and authority; when as he ſayth of the Claſſis, or of the Miniſters and Elders of the Churches round about, that they ſhould *advertiſe firſt*, which notes their admonition, and afterward *ſharply & ſeverely charge*, which implyes a commandement and authority therein. Therefore in Scripture one and the ſame * word is uſually and indifferently tranſlated either to *charge* or *command*, *Matt.* 10. 5. *Luk.* 8. 29. *Act.* 1. 4. & 4. 18. & 5. 28. 1. *Tim.* 4. 11. *with Luk.* 5. 14. & 8. 56. 1. *Tim.* 1. 18. & 5. 7. & 6. 13, 17. thereby to expreſſe a ſpeciall authoritie of ſuch as uſe the ſame. And the propriety of this word is thus declared by *Mr Cartwr.* himſelf, when expounding thoſe words of Paul, 1. *Tim.* 6. 13. he ſaith, (e) *It is to be noted that he ſaith* [I denounce or I charge] *he doth not ſay* [I exhort or give counſell] *leaving it to the liberty of Timothie.* And thus here we are in like manner to underſtand him, when he tells how a Claſſis of Miniſters and Elders were ſharply and ſeverely to *charge* a Church, that they uſed an authority more then of exhorting or admoniſhing and counſelling, ſo that the matter was not left in the liberty of them that were ſo charged.

* παραγγέλλω. παραγγελία.

(e) T. C. 1 Rep. p. 177.

II. He proceeds further, and after both admonition and a ſevere charge or prohibition, he ſhewes that the Claſſis hath yet more to doe in this buſines, if their charge be not regarded, in reſpect of the unlawfull election, viz. *that they confirme it not by ſuffering him to exerciſe any miniſtery.* Whereas ordinarily Miniſters newly elected are confirmed and ordained by impoſition of hands by ſome Miniſters of the Churches neere unto them; this *Mr Cartwr.* would have to be denyed unto him. And this denyall of his ordination after his election, is to be eſteemed a kinde of cenſure, in ſome ſort proportionable to the depoſition of a Miniſter already confirmed; ſeeing keeping out or caſting out from the Miniſtery, are actions of like nature. And this is that which *Mr Fenner*, who was well acquainted with the meaning of *Mr Cartwr.* in theſe things, poynteth at, when ſpeaking of a controverſy riſing in a Church about the calling of a Miniſter, he ſaith; (f) *that the cauſe is to be referred unto the judges whom it concerneth, (and who are after mentioned) that they may either ratify the election or make it fruſtrate.* Now in the Eccleſiaſticall politie theſe judges are no other then Claſſes or Synods, whereof he afterward ſpeakes; and this their abrogating and making voyd an unlawfull election, is a power more then ſimple admonition.

(f) S. Theol. l. 7. c. 2. p. 344.

III. *Whereas Mr Cartwr.* here ſaith, that *if either the Churches round about doe faile of this duety, or the Church which is admoniſhed, reſt not therein, then to bring it to the*

next

next Synod, &c. hereupon (g) D. *Whitgift* calles for proof of Scripture, commandement or example to justify this order. *Mr Cartw.* in his second Reply having first shewed other warrant for admonition by Churches, proceeds further and saith, (h) *That from the admonition of the Churches, it is meet to come to Synods, if the judgement of the Churches be contemned; may be shewed by proportion from the place of our Saviour Christ in S. Matthew, ch. 18. for as when one brother is not mooved with the admonition of two or three, the matter must be referred unto the Church, to see whether the majestie of it will moove him, whom the authority of two or three would not: even so it is meet that the Church, that maketh light of the judgement of two or three Churches, should be presed with the judgements of the Dioceſſe or Province, as shall be in that behalf advised.* From this proportion, seeing the rule, *Matt.* 18. was not onely a rule of admonition, but also a rule for the exercise of authority in censuring, it followes hence in like manner, that many Churches combined in a Synod, have power to censure as well as to admonish.

(g) Def of Answ. to Admon. p. 173.
(h) T. C. 2 Reply. p. 231, 232.

IV. *Mr Cartwr.* doth further declare his meaning in the same place, when he alledgeth the example of the Reformed Churches in this matter: *If I were in this poynt* (saith (i) he) *destitute of the word of God: yet the naked examples of the Reformed Churches ought to weigh downe a Popish custome.* Now it is undenyable, that the Reformed Churches doe allow the use of Classes and Synods, not onely for counsell or admonition, but also for the exercise of Ecclesiasticall authority and jurisdiction in judging of causes & censuring of offendours.

(i) Ibid. p. 232.

V. *Mr Cartwr.* speaking of the utmost that can be done by a Classis, or by Ministers and Elders of neighbour Churches in time of persecution, wanting a Christian Magistrate, against an obstinate Church that refuseth to be admonished, saith, (k) *If they excommunicate the whole Church, it is a hard matter, and yet if they may doe that; there is all they can doe.* To excommunicate *a whole Church* together, is indeed a hard thing, and such a thing as I never heard of in the practise of the Reformed Churches: yet this intimates that he thought they had a power of excommunicating at least some, if not all, upon a just occasion. And when *D. Whitg.* (l) answering to a testimony of Cyprian alledged by *Mr Cartwr.* saith, *Who ever denyed but that the Synods might excommunicate?* *Mr C.* (m) replying againe unto him, yet shewes no dislike at all or difference from his Opposite herein, which yet he ought to have done, if he had thought it an undue power, & to have reproved him for giving this power of the greatest censure, even of excommunication unto Synods. Hence it appeares that he was farre from limiting all jurisdictiō unto a particular Church; that he allowed Synods more power then of counselling or admonishing.

(k) T. C. 1 Repl. p. 52.
(l) Def. of Answ. to Adm. p. 675.
(m) Rest of 2 Rep. p. 89.

VI. *Mr Parker* speaking of this very place in *Mr Cartw.* and vindicating it from the opposition of *D. Whitg.* shewes that he agrees with me in the interpretation thereof, and not with *Mr Dav.* He sayth, (n) *Cum pressisset Thomas Cartwrightus Ecclesiarum Reformatarum morem, &c. When T. C. had urged the manner of the Reformed Churches in correcting the faulty election of Ministers, first by a Classis; if that prevayled not by a Synod; if that fayled also, by the Magistrate, &c.* For if the example, custome and practise of the Reformed Churches be urged herein, then doth he not speak of hindring an unlawfull election by admonition or counsell onely; then doth he acknowledge a further authority of judgement & censure in the Classes.

(n) Pol. Ecc. lib. 3. c. 24. p. 353.

VII. The judgement of *Mr Cartwr.* touching the authority of Synods is manifeſt by that right which he aſſcribeth unto them for the *deciſion* of cauſes, and not for counſell onely, as was ſhewed * before: and this may further be ſeen by that blame which is imputed unto him for Scottizing and Genevating, declared * hereafter. Had he bene of this new opinion, he could not have defended the cauſe of Reformation ſo as he did, but ſhould have opened the mouth of his adverſaries againſt him otherwiſe then he hath done.

* Pag. 47, 48.

* Chap. 7. ſect. 5.

SECT. II. *His Allegation of Mr Fenner examined.*

FOr *Mr Fenner*, in the allegation of his Teſtimony *Mr Dav.* hath made himſelf guilty of a threefold unfaithfulnes; 1. in the omiſſion of ſuch things as ſhew his minde fully touching Synods: 2. in the miſtranſlation of his words: 3. in the miſinterpretation and falſe collections that he maketh from them.

I. For his omiſſions: 1. He omitteth that definition of *Eccleſiaſticall politie*, ſet downe in the (o) beginning of that tractate, viz. that it is *a divine politie, ſo farre as it is inſtituted of Chriſt, for the government of particular Churches, joyntly and ſeverally.* This definition being admitted, overthrowes that *ſingle, uncompounded policie*, maintained by *Mr Iacob*; as alſo the aſſertion of *Mr Dav.* for *juriſdiction limited to particular Churches:* becauſe herein he allowes a compounded policie, not onely for counſell, but for the *government* of Churches, as well *joyntly* as ſeverally. Herein Eccleſiaſticall policie and juriſdiction is extended further then the limits of one particular Church, even unto a Synod or Claſſis; becauſe there is no *joynt* government of Churches perfectly found but in ſuch aſſemblies. The Scriptures alſo which *Mr Fenner* alledgeth for confirmation of this definition, being many of them taken from the old Teſtament, doe undenyably lead us unto ſuch a joynt & compound government of the Church. II. He omitteth the definition of a (p) particular Church, which Mr Fen. applyes as well to the Churches and Synagogues under the old Teſtament, as unto any ſince. This appeares in divers of the Scriptures and inſtances which he bringeth to confirme his definition, as namely, 1. *Sam.* 10. 5. *Pſa.* 107. 32. & 111. 1. *Luk.* 5. 17. *Mat.* 4. 23. Hereby it may appeare how farre different and contrary he is to Mr Iacob and thoſe of his opinion, (q) teaching that the Churches of the old and new Teſtament and their government, doe differ one from the other *in the very kinde, nature and forme; by a ſpecificall and eſſentiall difference, &c.* Then could not both have had one and the ſame definition, in ſuch ſort as Mr F. gives it unto them, comprehending alſo under it ſuch aſſemblies as ſtood under a compound policie, and were ſubject to an Eccleſiaſticall judicatorie out of themſelves. III. He omitteth that which Mr Fenner writes touching the election of a Miniſter, where the controverſy of the Church, upon the peoples objecting againſt the ſame, is to be referred unto ſuch judges, who (as is before noted) may either (r) *confirme or make voyd the Election*: A plaine acknowledgmēt of a lawfull power out of a particular Church to judge the cauſe thereof. IV. He omitteth that which Mr F. writes in the deſcription (ſ) both of the Elders office in generall, and of the Ruling Elders in particular, where the warrant and authority of their office is derived from the Elders in Iſrael, and from the government of the Jewiſh Church, as appeares in thoſe teſtimonies of Scripture which

(o) S. Theol. l. 7. c. 1. p. 241.

(p) Ibidē.

(q) Divine beg. & inſtit. of Chr. viſ. Church, A 1. A 2. A 4. C 8, &c.

(r) S. Theol. l. 7. p. 243, 244.

(ſ) Ibid. p. 245, 246.

which he alledgeth for proof thereof, as namely these, beside other, *Lev.* 4. 13, 14, 15. 2. *Kin.* 6. 32. *Ier.* 19. 1. *Ezek.* 8. 1. *Neh.* 8. 5. 8. 10. *Act.* 4. 5. & 6. 12. & 5. 21. Now seeing he derives their offices from that forme of government, which is confessed not to have bene a single, uncompounded policie; this is an evidence, that he also did not hold jurisdiction to be limited unto a particular Church. v. He omitteth that which Mr F. writes in distinguishing the Presbytery or Eldership of many Churches (t) into *a Synod or a Generall Councill*. And not to speak of other things, he omitteth that description of a Generall or *Vniversall Councill*, viz. that it is *a Presbyterie consisting of the deputies of many Synods, to determine and compound those things that may be profitable for the whole Church or for the greatest part thereof*. The word which he useth to expresse the authority exercised therein, when he saith, *ad ea statuenda*, t. i. *to determine, to make a statute or decree*, imports more then a bare admonition, or counsell: and therefore it is manifest from hence that Mr F. did not allow of this new Discipline, which denyes the authority of Synods.

(t) Ibid. p. 281.

II. His unfaithfull translation of *Mr Fenner* is also to be observed in divers points. 1. When speaking of the Eldership of one particular Church, (v) he tells how Mr F. saith, *it is properly called πρεσβυτέριον*. The words of Mr F. are, that it is (x) *proprio nomine sic dictum, so called with the proper name*: His meaning is, that in common use of speech it had the proper name given unto it; even as it comes to passe oft times that a part is called by the proper name of the whole, and one species or one sort receives the proper name of the whole kinde, as when in speaking commonly of the Ministers and Elders of a Church, the ruling Elders are so called with a proper name that belongs to the whole kinde, seeing Ministers of the word are Elders as well as they: 1. *Tim.* 5. 17. so when the ruling Elders are called with the proper name of *Governours*, 1. *Cor.* 12. 28. though Ministers of the word are governours also as well as they. And unlesse we thus understand Mr Fen. there should be no trueth in his words; for as he himself saith, (y) there is a *Synecdoche* in the name of Elders when it is given to Ecclesiasticall Governours: and therefore there must be a double improper or figurative speech, a double Synecdoche, when the assembly of some Officers in a particular Church is called with the proper name of the Eldership, whereas but some of them are elderly or aged men, and whereas the assembly of such men in a Synod is an Eldership as well as the other. 11. It is a notable falsification of Mr Fenners testimony, when as he distinguishing the Ecclesiasticall Eldership into the Eldership of a particular Church and into the Eldership of many Churches, and giving beforehand in the first place a generall definition of the Eldership, common to both those kindes, Mr Dav. comes and restraines that generall definition to one kinde, and brings in Mr F. speaking on this manner, *The Eldership of the first sort, he sayth, is a compound office wherein all the Elders doe, in the name of the whole Church, administer all the businesses &c.* But this Mr F. hath not sayd: I desire the Reader to look on the (z) place, as also on that which followes in his * transition, from the generall unto the species and severall sorts of the Eldership, and there to behold how grosly Mr D. corrupteth the words of Mr F. and abuseth the reader, and that in a point of maine consequence touching our question: for while Mr F. gives the same generall

(v) Apol. reply. p. 238.

(x) S. Thom. l. 1. 7. p. 279.

(y) Ibid. p. 245.

(z) S. Thom. l. 1. 7. p. 276.

* Pag. 279.

rall definition to the Elderſhip of many Churches, viz. to Claſſes and Synods, which he gives unto the Elderſhip of a particular Church, thereby the ſame authority and juriſdiction which he gives herein unto a particular Church is alſo given by him unto a Synod, the Elderſhip of many Churches: and then are not Synods for counſell onely or admonition, but they are to exerciſe a juriſdiction and power as well as particular Churches. III. Another inſtance of his unfaithfull tranſlation, is to be obſerved from thoſe words of Mr F. (a) *poſtea autem auditis & aſſentientibus, decernenda & pro decretis Eccleſiis proponenda ſunt*; which he tranſlates thus, (b) *and afterwards, the opinions and aſſent of all being declared, matters are to be concluded.* Thoſe laſt words ſhould have bene tranſlated thus; *matters are to be decreed and to be propounded unto the Churches for decrees*: and being thus tranſlated they import an act of authority, and a power of juriſdiction, in making decrees, which are more then counſell or admonition, eſpecially when thoſe matters ſo decreed are propounded unto the Churches for decrees. But the word of *concluding* which Mr D. uſeth is ambiguous, and is applyed ſometimes to the reaſonings of men, either in private or publick, where there is no authority to give definitive ſentence, or to make decrees for the Churches. *Mr Canne* himſelf, though he condemne the Claſſes and Synods of the Reformed Churches, yet doth he allow Miniſters and brethren of divers Churches to come together, (c) *to conferre of things, yea and to conclude (if they can) what they judge meet &c.* This uſe of the word *conclude* ſerves to elude and fruſtrate this pregnant teſtimony of their power. IV. Another miſtranſlation is, when in the ſame page, thoſe words of Mr F. *leges maximi momenti conſtituendæ*, are thus tranſlated by him, *orders alſo of the greateſt moment to be made*. This I doe therefore note the rather, becauſe Mr D. keeps ſo great a quoile about the ſtrict difference betwixt orders and lawes, and ſaith (d) that *orders & lawes are ill confounded* by me, and is large in declaring his minde therein. His friend alſo that made the Alphabeticall Table for him, and prefixed it before his book, notes this as a remarkable matter therein, * *Lawes and orders differ*. Now if theſe things be ſo, then hath he done very ill in confounding lawes and orders, by tranſlating the word *leges*, *orders*, when he ſhould have tranſlated it *lawes*, according to the right and proper ſignification thereof. If he had diſliked Mr F. for uſing the word *leges*, or *lawes*, and would correct it by putting in the word *orders*; this was more then an exact and faithfull Tranſlatour might doe. He ſhould rather have tranſlated the word truely, according to the right ſignification, and then have given warning to the Reader touching the fault of Mr Fenner in the ill confounding of lawes and orders, and putting one for the other. After theſe unfaithfull omiſſions and miſtranſlations, *Mr Dav.* hath not bene afraid to ſay confidently of himſelf; *Thus have I faithfully tranſlated the words of this eminent light in his time, Mr Dudley Fenner, who was joyned with Mr Cartwright, &c.* To his commendation of him I doe willingly aſſent: he was indeed an *eminent light*: and why then hath Mr Dav. gone about to obſcure his light, by depraving his teſtimony, and labouring to put this bright-burning candle under a buſhell, that men ſhould not ſee his light? Whether he make ſtrongly for him or againſt me, let others judge.

III. Moreover after theſe omiſſions and miſtranſlations, come we to conſider

(a) Ibid. p. 278.
(b) Apol. reply. p. 239.
(c) Churches plea, p. 95.
(d) Apol. rep. p. 257, 258.
* Letter L.

der his miſcollections from him, which without any juſt deduction or inference, upon the lame and imperfect recitall of his words, he thus propoundeth: (e) *The Reader may ſee how he leaveth the wholl power of juriſdiction in the particular Church, &c.* How untrue this is it may appeare, I. By Mr F. his alledging thoſe (f) Scriptures, *Deut.* 17.9. *with* 2. *Chron.* 19.8, 11. *Matt.* 18.18. 1. *Tim.* 4.14. to ſhew what authority there is in a Claſſis or Synod, comprehended by him under that generall definition of a Preſbyterie, as well as the Elderſhip of a particular Church: thereby he confeſſeth, that there is a power of judgement, cenſure and juriſdiction in Synods; becauſe thoſe teſtimonies of Scripture ſpeak of ſuch juriſdiction and judgement, of binding and looſing, of impoſition of hands or ordination, &c. II. Though Mr F. ſpeaking of excommunication and abſolution from it, ſayth that they are to be done in the aſſembly, *by the authority of the whole Church*, which laſt words Mr D. for ſpeciall obſervation cauſeth to be printed in great capitall letters; yet this doth not prove that he left *the whole power of juriſdiction in the particular Church*: ſeeing in the ſame (g) place ſpeaking of Eccleſiaſticall judgements adminiſtred by the Synod or Preſbytery in deciding of doubts, he ſaith alſo, *etſi authoritas communis ſit, miniſtris tamen & ſententiam dicendi & eam exponendi maxima faciendа poteſtas*: that is, *though the authority be common, yet the greateſt power of giving ſentence and declaring it is to be yeelded unto the Miniſters.* Therefore did he not leave the whole power of juriſdiction in a particular Church. III. Mr F. a little after againe ſpeaking of Eccleſiaſticall judgements and cenſures, and ſtill of adminiſtring them by the Eccleſiaſticall Senate or Preſbytery, which contained the Synod as well as a particular Elderſhip, he ſayth of them, (h) *In quibus, per omnes Eccleſias ſumma Eccleſiaſtica poteſtas Preſbyterio demandata eſt*: that is, *In which throughout all Churches the higheſt* or chiefeſt *Eccleſiaſticall authority is committed to the Preſbytery.* And hereby alſo it appeares that he did not leave the whole power of juriſdiction in a particular Church. But theſe paſſages Mr D. omitted, when he tranſlated other parts of the ſame periods: He thought it not to be for his advantage to have his Reader take knowledge of them. IV. Whereas Mr F. requireth, that in matters of greateſt moment, after the Προβάλησις or fore-conſultation of the Preſbytery, comprehending both Claſſis and particular Elderſhip, their counſels be told unto the Church; that thing ordinarily is thus performed in theſe Reformed Churches, viz. after that in the Claſſicall aſſembly of Miniſters and Elders it hath bene found juſt and requiſite, that any perſons ſhould be excommunicated or any Miniſters called, theſe cenſures and elections are then firſt ſolemnely propounded unto the particular Church, whom theſe things ſpecially concerne, and ſo accompliſhed with their conſent, and not otherwiſe: if the greater part of the Church diſſent and allow not the excommunication or election; then for the avoyding of ſtrife, the matter is againe referred *ad majorem Senatum*, unto a greater Eccleſiaſtical Senate, Claſſis or Synod, to judge thereof and to compoſe the diſſention. V. Mr F. in the ſame chapter, (i) ſhewes from the Scriptures that in theſe Preſbyteriall aſſemblies there ought to be a mutuall office performed in the ſame in ſpeciall manner towards one another, not onely for counſels, but alſo for the cenſures of ſuch as are members of thoſe aſſemblies. And this is alſo agree-

(e) Ibidē.

(f) S. Theo. l. 7. p. 276.

(g) Pa. 277

(h) Ibidē.

(i) Pag. 278 279.

able

rall definition to the Elderſhip of many Churches, viz. to Claſſes and Synods; which he gives unto the Elderſhip of a particular Church, thereby the ſame authority and juriſdiction which he gives herein unto a particular Church is alſo given by him unto a Synod, the Elderſhip of many Churches: and then are not Synods for counſell onely or admonition, but they are to exerciſe a juriſdiction and power as well as particular Churches. III. Another inſtance of his unfaithfull tranſlation, is to be obſerved from thoſe words of Mr F. (a) *poſtea autem auditis & aſſentientibus, decernenda & pro decretis Eccleſiis proponenda ſunt*; which he tranſlates thus, (b) *and afterwards, the opinions and aſſent of all being declared, matters are to be concluded.* Thoſe laſt words ſhould have bene tranſlated thus; *matters are to be decreed and to be propounded unto the Churches for decrees*: and being thus tranſlated they import an act of authority, and a power of juriſdiction, in making decrees, which are more then counſell or admonition, eſpecially when thoſe matters ſo decreed are propounded unto the Churches for decrees. But the word of *concluding* which Mr D. uſeth is ambiguous, and is applyed ſometimes to the reaſonings of men, either in private or publick, where there is no authority to give definitive ſentence, or to make decrees for the Churches. *Mr Canne* himſelf, though he condemne the Claſſes and Synods of the Reformed Churches, yet doth he allow Miniſters and brethren of divers Churches to come together, (c) *to conferre of things, yea and to conclude (if they can) what they judge meet &c.* This uſe of the word *conclude* ſerves to elude and fruſtrate this pregnant teſtimony of their power. IV. Another miſtranſlation is, when in the ſame page, thoſe words of Mr F. *leges maximi momenti conſtituendæ*, are thus tranſlated by him, *orders alſo of the greateſt moment to be made*. This I doe therefore note the rather, becauſe Mr D. keeps ſo great a quoile about the ſtrict difference betwixt orders and lawes, and ſaith (d) that *orders & lawes are ill confounded* by me, and is large in declaring his minde therein. His friend alſo that made the Alphabeticall Table for him, and prefixed it before his book, notes this as a remarkable matter therein, * *Lawes and orders differ*. Now if theſe things be ſo, then hath he done very ill in confounding lawes and orders, by tranſlating the word *leges*, *orders*, when he ſhould have tranſlated it *lawes*, according to the right and proper ſignification thereof. If he had diſliked Mr F. for uſing the word *leges*, or *lawes*, and would correct it by putting in the word *orders*; this was more then an exact and faithfull Tranſlatour might doe. He ſhould rather have tranſlated the word truely, according to the right ſignification, and then have given warning to the Reader touching the fault of Mr Fenner in the ill confounding of lawes and orders, and putting one for the other. After theſe unfaithfull omiſſions and miſtranſlations, *Mr Dav.* hath not bene afraid to ſay confidently of himſelf; *Thus have I faithfully tranſlated the words of this eminent light in his time, Mr Dudley Fenner, who was joyned with Mr Cartwright, &c.* To his commendation of him I doe willingly aſſent: he was indeed an *eminent light*: and why then hath Mr Dav. gone about to obſcure his light, by depraving his teſtimony, and labouring to put this bright-burning candle under a buſhell, that men ſhould not ſee his light? Whether he make ſtrongly for him or againſt me, let others judge.

III. Moreover after theſe omiſſions and miſtranſlations, come we to conſider

(a) Ibid. p. 278.
(b) Apol. reply. p. 239.
(c) Churches plea, p. 95.
(d) Apol. rep. p. 257, 258.
* Letter L.

der his miſcollections from him, which without any juſt deduction or inference, upon the lame and imperfect recitall of his words, he thus propoundeth: (e) *The Reader may ſee how he leaveth the wholl power of juriſdiction in the particular Church, &c.* How untrue this is it may appeare, 1. By Mr F. his alledging thoſe (f) Scriptures, *Deut.* 17.9. *with* 2. *Chron.* 19.8, 11. *Matt.* 18.18. 1. *Tim.* 4.14. to ſhew what authority there is in a Claſſis or Synod, comprehended by him under that generall definition of a Preſbyterie, as well as the Elderſhip of a particular Church: thereby he confeſſeth, that there is a power of judgement, cenſure and juriſdiction in Synods; becauſe thoſe teſtimonies of Scripture ſpeak of ſuch juriſdiction and judgement, of binding and looſing, of impoſition of hands or ordination, &c. 11. Though Mr F. ſpeaking of excommunication and abſolution from it, ſayth that they are to be done in the aſſembly, *by the authority of the whole Church*, which laſt words Mr D. for ſpeciall obſervation cauſeth to be printed in great capitall letters; yet this doth not prove that he left *the whole power of juriſdiction in the particular Church*: ſeeing in the ſame (g) place ſpeaking of Eccleſiaſticall judgements adminiſtred by the Synod or Preſbytery in deciding of doubts, he ſaith alſo, *etſi authoritas communis ſit, miniſtris tamen & ſententiam dicendi & eam exponendi maxima faciendа poteſtas*: that is, *though the authority be common, yet the greateſt power of giving ſentence and declaring it is to be yeelded unto the Miniſters.* Therefore did he not leave the whole power of juriſdiction in a particular Church. 111. Mr F. a little after againe ſpeaking of Eccleſiaſticall judgements and cenſures, and ſtill of adminiſtring them by the Eccleſiaſticall Senate or Preſbytery, which contained the Synod as well as a particular Elderſhip, he ſayth of them, (h) *In quibus, per omnes Eccleſias ſumma Eccleſiaſtica poteſtas Preſbyterio demandata eſt*: that is, *In which throughout all Churches the higheſt* or chiefeſt *Eccleſiaſticall authority is committed to the Preſbytery.* And hereby alſo it appeares that he did not leave the whole power of juriſdiction in a particular Church. But theſe paſſages Mr D. omitted, when he tranſlated other parts of the ſame periods: He thought it not to be for his advantage to have his Reader take knowledge of them. 1v. Whereas Mr F. requireth, that in matters of greateſt moment, after the Προβάλησις or fore-conſultation of the Preſbytery, comprehending both Claſſis and particular Elderſhip, their counſels be told unto the Church; that thing ordinarily is thus performed in theſe Reformed Churches, viz. after that in the Claſſicall aſſembly of Miniſters and Elders it hath bene found juſt and requiſite, that any perſons ſhould be excommunicated or any Miniſters called, theſe cenſures and elections are then firſt ſolemnely propounded unto the particular Church, whom theſe things ſpecially concerne, and ſo accompliſhed with their conſent, and not otherwiſe: if the greater part of the Church diſſent and allow not the excommunication or election; then for the avoyding of ſtrife, the matter is againe referred *ad majorem Senatum*, unto a greater Eccleſiaſtical Senate, Claſſis or Synod, to judge thereof and to compoſe the diſſention. v. Mr F. in the ſame chapter, (i) ſhewes from the Scriptures that in theſe Preſbyteriall aſſemblies there ought to be a mutuall office performed in the ſame in ſpeciall manner towards one another, not onely for counſels, but alſo for the cenſures of ſuch as are members of thoſe aſſemblies. And this is alſo agree-

able

(e) Ibidē.

(f) S. Theo. l. 7. p. 176.

(g) Pa. 277

(h) Ibidē.

(i) Pag. 278 279.

able to the order prescribed both in the (k) Nationall Synod at Dort, and in divers others; for the censure of such faults as are committed in those meetings, or by contempt of the admonitions of inferiour assemblies. Hereby also it appeares that he allowed an Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in Synods and Classes, and did not limit all jurisdiction unto a particular Church. VI. After Mr F. had spoken in generall both of the Presbytery of one and of many Churches joyntly together, then he comes to speak of each of them severally: and there againe speaking of the Presbytery of many Churches, that is, of Classes and Synods, he saith, (l) *Hic autem leges Ecclesiasticæ condendæ sunt, Here are Ecclesiasticall lawes to be made.* This was a power of jurisdiction, more then of admonition or counsell. This Mr D. passeth over also; it was no pollicy for him to draw collections from such testimonies. VII. That one testimony of Scripture which Mr F. oft (m) alledgeth, 2.Cor.8.19,23. (not to speak of others alledged with it) is an evidence of the authority of Synods. It is there specifyed that the brother who was chosen to be a messenger of the Churches, was $ *elected by suffrages:* now this election was an act of authority, exercised by sundry Churches in one businesse, touching one person; and hence it appeareth, that a combination of Churches may exercise jurisdiction together touching such as are no peculiar members of one particular Church. And if such election may be made by many Churches, then may censures be decreed by many Churches together as occasion requires. Lastly, Mr F. having spoken of the first part of Ecclesiasticall politie, touching such as administer the same both by a simple and compound office in the Presbytery, both of one or more Churches, in Synods or Generall Councils, he comes at last to speak of the duety of the Saints, other members of the Church, which are not promoted unto any Ecclesiasticall office, and (n) sets this downe *for a common law unto them all, that they be subject in all those things aforesayd, and further the same according to their power, with their gifts, labour, and what soever way they are able. Hebr.* 13. 17. This peculiar bond of speciall obedience and submission unto such Officers, even in Synods as well as in other ordinances, is an argument, that he thought them to have speciall authority, more then of admonition & counsell.

(k) Kereken-Ordeninge, Art. 43.

(l) S. Theol. l.7.p.280.

(m) Ibid.p. 280,281.

$ χειροτονηθεὶς.

(n) Ibid.p. 242 with p.282.

The judgement of *Mr Fenner*, this worthy Writer being thus cleared and vindicated from those unfaithfull omissions, mistranslations and miscollections of Mr D. his demand is hereby answered, and hereby he may see why I referred him to this book. As for those matters of fact which he addes, the untrueth thereof is elswhere to be declared. We will now proceed to Mr Dav. his third allegation.

SECT. III. *His Allegation of Mr Parker examined.*

IO. DAV. (o) *For Mr Parker. He largely and strongly proveth this position,* (p) Potestas Ecclesiastica essentialiter & primariò in ipsâ Ecclesiâ, tanquam in subjecto proprio, residet. The power Ecclesiasticall doth essentially and primarily reside in the Church itself, as in its proper subject. *The sense wherein he thus spake, to prevent all suspicion of his pleading for popular confusion, he declareth out of Zanchy, who saith,* toti Ecclesiæ dedisse Christum claves, sed ita ut in Ecclesiâ certi essent, *qui* clavibus utantur ad salutem Ecclesiæ, honoremque Dei. That Christ gave the keyes to the wholl Church, but so, that there should be certaine men that should use the

(o) Apol. reply. p. 240, 241.

(p) De Polit. Eccl. l.3.c.1

Zanch. in præcept. 4. qu.3.

the keyes to the good of the Church and glory of God. *For the proof of the former, that the right of power is in every particular Church, he useth five Arguments; in the 6. & 7. chapters, and then in the 8. chapter, he commeth to speak of the exercise and ordinary execution of this power, which is, he sayth, in the Church-officers or rulers; yet with this moderation, that the dispensation of the Churches power in the Officers be according to a well tempered forme, partly Aristocraticall, partly Democraticall, the Church committing those things to the Presbytery, which it cannot commodiously performe by it selfe, and retaining that exercise of power which belongs to the dignity, authority, and liberty which it hath received from Christ. Thus he wholy destroyeth that Democraty, or popular Anarchy, which Beza justly condemneth in Morellius, and is by some unjustly imputed to those that plead for a due reformation of Churches, according to the rules of the word, and the primitive patternes. Of the first sort of things, which the Church committeth to the Rulers, because it cannot commodiously performe them by it selfe, he speaketh in cap. 9. 10. 11.* ANSVV. Mr Dav. professed and promised touching Mr *Parker* and these other Writers, that he would *shew them to be strongly against me*: but though he make a long discourse of his writing, and doe alledge in grosse eleven chapters at once out of Mr Parker; yet doe I not finde that he applyes any thing to the question against me. for I. Suppose it be granted (which yet some godly and learned men deny) that all power Ecclesiasticall is essentially and primarily in the Church, as the proper subject thereof, and from thence derived and communicated to other, either particular persons, or assemblies of Classes and Synods; what is this to our question? doth it follow from hence that Synods have no power to judge Ecclesiasticall causes, or that they are onely for counsell or admonition? This is the poynt of our question; but this neither *Mr Parker* affirmes, neither doth Mr D. offer to conclude it by any just consequence from his words: and so all that he alledgeth is not to the purpose. II. This very derivation of power from particular Churches unto Classes and Synods, is an argument of the power of judgement that is in them: for what great need was there of a derivative power to consult or to admonish onely? Mr D. confesseth that (q) *every Christian hath power of admonition in another for his good.* And shall Synods have no more power then particular and private persons? III. Whereas Mr *Parker* distinguisheth betwixt *the power* of the Church and *the exercise* of that power, and acknowledgeth that the execution of this power in the administration of the Word and Sacraments is not in the whole Church, but in some speciall persons appoynted thereunto; it followeth hence that in some things the Ministers and Governours of a Church have a power which the Church cannot exercise without them; and therefore in some respect a greater authority then the whole Church beside them. This is confessed in the practise of the Brownists themselves, who keep their children sometimes unbaptised for many yeares together, while they want Ministers that have authority to baptise. IV. The Authors alledged by Mr Parker, to shew that Ecclesiasticall power is originally in the Church, did never draw any such consequence from thence, that therefore there is no power of jurisdiction in Synods, but made the contrary conclusion, that therefore there was a power of jurisdiction in them. And this conclusion was made, not onely by the *Councell of Constance and Basill*,

(q) Apol. reply. p. 47.

(r) Ibid. p. 237, 238. (f) De Cõc. qu. 5. p. 170.

Ioh. Gerson & Schola Parisiensis, but by D. *Whitaker* also, whom Mr Dav. (r) alledgeth as if he made for him, who yet reasons strongly against him, saying, (f) *If a particular Church have greater authority in judgements then Peter, or any particular man, then much more the universall Church, which is represented in a generall Councell* or Synod.

v. For *Mr Parker* himself, though he be very large touching the originall power of particular Churches, and the derivation thereof unto Ministers & Synods; yet he never concludeth from hence a want of jurisdiction in Synods, but declares the contrary in many (t) places, as is to be shewed hereafter. In the meane time let us consider how Mr Dav. proceeds in alledging *Mr Parker*.

(t) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 20, & 23, 24. &c.

I. Dav. *Of the second sort of things, which the Church retaineth in it self, because it can commodiously exercise them by it selfe, he speaketh in cap. 12. Wherein by 22 Arguments, he proveth the Churches superiority over her Pastors and rulers, in 3 respects, 1. of the end, the power which they have being given them for her ædification, 2. in respect of the application of it to the persons, 3. in respect of regulating the use of it, if it be abused.*

Answv. 1. If those 22 Arguments of Mr Park. be good and effectuall to prove the Churches superiority over her Rulers; then have we so many sound Arguments to prove the authority of Classes and Synods. This is evident, because Mr P. applyes those 22 Arguments to prove the jurisdiction of Synods as well as of particular Churches. His affirmation is (v) that *the superiorit of jurisdiction is retained in every Church, so that neither the Pastour in the Prime Church, nor the Præsident in the Combined Church, nor yet any Bishop is above the Church, but under the power of every Church.* This distinction of the Church is more plainly declared by him afterward, where he saith, (x) *Est itaque visibilis Ecclesia duplex, Prima et Orta, Prima, est collectio singulorum fidelium in unam Congregationem, et generali nomine Ecclesia dicitur. Orta, est collectio & combinatio Ecclesiarum primarum plurium in unum cœtum, & appellatur Synodus.* that is, *The visible Church is of two sorts, The Prime and the Combined Church. The Prime Church is a collection of severall faithfull persons into one Congregation, and is called by a generall name, the Church. The Combined Church is a collection of more prime Churches into one company, & is called a Synod.* Now the jurisdiction which he speakes of, he makes common to both, and expressely applyes it to both, to the combined Church or Synod, as well as to the particular or prime Church. And further that in the 12. chapter he spake generally of both these kindes of Churches, he manifests in the first words of the 13. chapter, where he begins thus, (y) *Hitherto we have spoken of the Church in generall, so farre as it is the subject of Ecclesiasticall politie, now let us come to the divers kindes thereof.* 11. Notwithstanding the superiority of the Church, yet Mr Par. (z) acknowledgeth the authority of the Pastour to be very great, as having it immediately from Christ, and not onely the authority, but also the exercise of the same authority and jurisdiction; in which respect he saith he is superiour not to men onely, but to the Angels themselves, *Gal.* 1. 8. as being in Christs stead, 2. *Cor.* 5. 19, 20. so long as he useth this authority lawfully. And repeating the same againe, he proceeds further when he saith, that if he doe not lawfully exercise his authority in the administration of the Word and Sacraments, then he ceaseth to be a Pastour, (a) *quo casu solo, tum suæ Ecclesiæ subjectum esse dicimus: in which case alone we say that he is subject unto his Church.* If in this case alone (which I durst

(v) Poli. Eccl. l. 3. c. 12. p. 77.

(x) Ibid. c. 23. p. 117.

(y) Ibidē.

(z) Ibid. p. 77.

(a) Ibid. p. 88.

I durſt not have ſayd) then in other caſes, the authority of many Paſtours & Elders, eſpecially meeting together in a Synod, may exerciſe an authority ſuperiour unto one particular Church.

I. DAV. *And in cap. 18. 13. making a compariſon between a particular Church, and Churches combined in Synods and Claſſes, he affirmeth that the difference between them is, not in the intenſive conſideration of their power (which the Congregation hath, in reference to the Keyes, within it ſelfe) but in the extenſive power onely, wherein the Synod hath a power extended to more objects, viz. to many Churches (in things common) whereas the power of a particular Church is confined, and limited within its owne compaſſe.* ANSVV. In this 13. chap. (for that number of 18. ſeemes to be miſtaken) *Mr Parker* doth againe give divers pregnant teſtimonies for the authority and juriſdiction of Synods. I. In the place alledged his words are theſe: (b) *I diſtinguiſh touching the power of the keyes, which is intenſive or extenſive. No prime Church, no not the leaſt of them doth want the intenſive power; but it wants that extenſive which a Synod hath, ſeeing the power* thereof *is extended to many Churches; whereas the power of the prime* or particular *Church is not extended beyond her owne bounds.* The power of the keyes is a power of juriſdiction, an Eccleſiaſticall power of binding and looſing; whether intenſive or extenſive: this power he confeſſeth to be in a Synod; and therefore the uſe of Synods is not onely for counſell or admonition, but for juriſdiction alſo in the judgement of cauſes. Whereas according to Mr D. his allegation, the difference betwixt the power of a particular Church and of a Synod is *in the extenſive power onely*; therefore the Synod is alſo of greater power and juriſdiction in extenſion unto many Churches. II. In comparing the power of a particular Church with a Synod, he ſayth expreſſely, (c) *Major quidem poteſtas eſt Synodi, quam unius alicujus Eccleſiæ primæ & parochialis. Greater is the power of a Synod, then of any one prime or pariſhionall Church.* But if Synods could onely counſell and admoniſh, & a particular Church beſides that, could cenſure and uſe Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, then ſhould a particular Church have greater power then a Synod: and not onely greater intenſive power, but as great extenſive; ſeeing a particular Church, yea or a particular perſon may give counſell or admonition, either to a Synod, or to many Churches, as occaſion ſhall require. It is true indeed which Mr P. ſaith, that *all the pariſhionall Churches* are greater then their Synods, ſeeing by a new Synod they may abrogate that which was ordained amiſſe by their Deputies, without their conſent, ſentence and will. This he proves by many arguments, and this we willingly conſent unto; this is the practiſe of all the Reformed Churches. But this is ſufficient for the queſtion in hand, that a Synod hath the power of the keyes, and juriſdiction, and greater authority then any one Church. III. This is another concluſion of Mr Parkers. (d) *We ſay there is one forme of government inſtituted of Chriſt in all Churches, both prime and combined: ſo that we may not dreame there is in the prime Church a different forme from that which is in the combined Church: neither may we imagine that in the combined Church there is another different from that by which the prime Church is governed.* If this aſſertion be true, then Mr Dav. and thoſe of his minde do dreame, when they imagine ſo different a forme of government to be inſtituted in the particular Churches and Synods, which he calles the combined Churches,

(b) Pol. Ec. cl. l. 2. c. 13. p. 121.

(c) Ibid. p. 129.

(d) Ibid. p. 120.

that one sort of them should onely give counsell & admonition, & the other exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction & censure.

(e) Apol. reply. p. 241, 242.

I. DAV. (e) *The same authour, in the 20 chapter, speaking of the summity, or supremacy of the power of particular Congregations, propoundeth the due limits of it, wherein, he conceiveth, it is to be understood, and bounded, as that the power of particular Churches is chief. 1. in its owne matters, not in things common to many Churches. 2. in case it be able to transact its owne matters within it selfe: as, if a doubt or controversy arise, the Church hath power to terminate it, if it can: as the Church of Antioch first disputed the matter among themselves, and laboured to compose the difference within themselves, but finding (not a want of right to end it among themselves, but) need of more helpe, they sent to Ierusalem freely for the help of their counsell, in this matter. 3. In case of right and lawfull administration. 4. In case of no evill administration presumed by those, who, finding themselves wronged by an unjust sentence, appeale to the judgement of the Synod. In which 3 last limitations, other Churches (to whose judgement, or advice, persons injuried by an unjust sentence appeale) doe concurr, in way of counsail, & declaratiõ of their judgement, to helpe particular Churches to exercise their power aright, in their owne matters, as was before noated out of Mr Cartwr. & Mr Fen. & out of the Authour himselfe in the foregoing passages. which being so understood, doeth not justifie any undue power of jurisdiction, if it be exercised by the Classis over that Church in the cases & manner complained of by the Subscribers: & how fully it agreeth with my stating of the question in the beginning of this Section, will appeare to the indifferent Reader, whē he shall have compared both together.* ANSVV. The judgment of Mr P. is very partially & corruptly described by Mr D. in this place. for whereas Mr P. here describes 4 bridles of restraint, or 4 limitations by which the supremacie of power in particular Congregations is to be moderated and kept within bounds, lest it should seem to be absolute; by every one of these it is manifest, that he acknowledged this authority, power and jurisdiction of Synods, and that they were not onely for counsell and admonition. He sayth, (f)

P. 47. P. 239.

(f) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 20. p. 301, 302.

The first limitation is ad rem propriam, unto their proper businesse, *for in a common matter the Synod is chief, that is, the authority of Churches joynly gathered together, is the chiefest.* Hence it is confessed that Synods have power of jurisdiction over Churches: for 1. In judging these common causes particular Churches, though differing one from an other are overswayed by the most voyces; and each Congregation is subject to the sentence of the Synod. 2. Let any Scripture be alledged by Mr Dav. to shew the summity or soveraignty of Synods in these common causes, and he shall finde thereby the use of Synods proved to be for jurisdiction in one Ecclesiasticall cause as well as in another being lawfully brought unto them. for, what reason is there, why the counsell and admonition of a Synod, may not suffice for the help of particular Churches in a common controversy as well as in other speciall businesses, leaving the sentence and decision unto the prime Churches?

The second limitation is also in a proper businesse; to wit ad casum sufficientis potestatis, in the case of sufficient ability: *for if any Church be found unable to end their owne businesse: who doubts but that it is bound to require the help of fellow-Churches?* In this case Mr P. acknowledgeth the superiority or soveraignty of power and authority in

in Synods: but if Synods were onely for counsell & admonition, what needed a supremacy of power; seeing inferiours may give counsell unto their superiours, & admonish them also of their duety? Mr P. shewes well that in case of impotencie, or weaknes, the Church of Antioch sent to Ierusalem, &c. *Act.* 15. But this Mr D. seeks to pervert by his glosse, when he saith, they sent to Ierusalem *for the help of their counsell*, as though they did not as well desire help by their authority and sentence in determining the controversy. If counsell onely had bene sought, why did not the Synod at Ierusalem content themselves to give counsell and advise? why did they also make a decree, and this not onely by authority of the Apostles, but also by common authority of Elders and others that were in the Synod? *Act.* 15.23. & 16.4.

The third limitation is in a proper busines, and ability also, to wit in the case of right and lawfull administration. *for vve are to think the same of the Church, as of every Pastour of the Church: now vve have shewed before out of Gerson, touching the rectour, that he in case of right administration is subject to none, yet in case of aberration is subject: so the Church which in case of right administration is subject to none, yet in case of aberration doth now beginne to be subject. Even as therefore the Pastour erring and offending is subject to no one of his fellowes, as to a Bishop, but onely to many of his Church: so also the Church that erreth and offendeth is subject to no one Church, as to a Dioceſan, but to many assembled together in a lawfull Synod.* Hence it is evident that Mr P. ascribed unto Synods more authority, then a bare counsell or admonition onely: for 1. He often useth the word of *subjection*, which implyes an authority and jurisdiction in those to whom in regard of their calling men be *subject*. This is passed by as unseen or unregarded in Mr D. his allegation. 2. He speakes of being subject so as the Pastour erring and offending is subject to many of the Church, that is to their jurisdiction and censure. 3. He speakes of such subjection as is distinguished from receyving of counsell and admonition: otherwise it should not be true which he sayth of the Pastours and Churches subjection; seeing every Pastour erring and offending is bound to receyve counsell or admonition from any one of his fellowes; and the Church erring & offending is bound to receyve counsell or admonition from any one particular Church, though it be not subject to the jurisdiction of any one in speciall, but onely to many in a lawfull Synod.

The fourth limitation is in case of right administration, when no evill administration is presumed [or imagined.] *for although the Church administer aright, yet if any man thinking himself wronged, do appeale from it, the same is now become obnoxious* [or *subject unto the censure of*] *her fellowes and sisters, so that judgement may be given in a Synod touching her administration.* That Mr P. here also speakes of subjection unto the jurisdiction of Synods, it is evident, while for the allowance of appeales he alledges in the same place the testimonies of the Synod of Sardica, of the Universitie of Paris, and of D. Whitaker, who doe all speak of Eccleſiasticall jurisdiction for the correction and redresse of unrighteous sentences and proceedings by inferiour judges. Againe in the same chapter, he sayth, (g) *Christ would have every man to be judged of his owne Church, Matt.* 18. *or if the judgement of his owne Church displease him, yet alwayes of the Church, that is, of a Synod of many Churches.* Againe in the same (g) Pa. 318

page, *We certainly finde Mat.* 18. *that causes are to be ended by the Synods of the Churches and not by one man, if any doe appeale from the judgement of his Church.* Thus we see, 1. that he makes *Mat.* 18. a common ground for the jurisdiction of Synods, as well as of particular Churches. 2. The very phrase of terminating or ending controversies, shewes that he spake of jurisdiction; because counsell alone is not sufficient to end controversies, unlesse there be authority and jurisdiction exercised withall. And further, whereas D. Bilson had sayd, that Synods have had more power then Elderships, Mr Parker assenteth, saying, (h) *So truely it ought to have bene done, that they should onely have more: but this more serveth not your purpose, but contradicteth it: for if they have had onely more, it followeth that the Elderships alwayes ought to have had some power, though lesse.* Thus expressely he acknowledgeth a power of jurisdiction in Synods, as well as in Elderships: and many the like assertions (if need were) might further be noted out of the same chapter.

(h) Pa. 303

Hereby it appeares how vaine it is which Mr D. saith, that in the 3 last limitations other Churches doe concurr, *in way of counsell and declaration of their judgment*, as if that were all they did; as if the Synod consisting of those Churches did not give definitive sentence of causes brought unto them. And hereby it may withall appeare, how the judgement of Mr Parker doth agree with the practise of the Reformed Churches, which doe exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in their Synods, according to those 4 limitations specifyed by him. There is no matter determined by them and judged in their Synods, but it may be reduced to one of these 4 heads; it is either a common cause, or a case of impotency, where there is need of help, or an unlawfull administration in some, or at least a presumption of evill dealing.

I. DAV. (i) *Thus have we examined his owne witnesses, and finde them to be wholly for us in this cause.* ANSVV. Whether the forenamed witnesses, *Mr Cartwr. Mr Fenner, and Mr Parker*, be wholly for Mr Dav. and those of his opinion, let the Reader judge. His examination of Mr Par. in speciall, is done by the halves; but before we come to speak of other pregnant testimonies which Mr P. hath given touching the authority and power of Synods, omitted by Mr D. we will first examine another allegation which he had set downe before, (k) where he labours to prove that the lawfull combination of particular Churches in Classes & Synods, is *by way of counsell or brotherly direction*, and not otherwise.

(i) Apol. reply. p. 242.

(k) Ibid. p. 226. 227.

I. DAV. *The reasons whereby it may be proved, are weighty. Mr Parker hath saved me the labour of this taske, by laying downe six Arguments, for the proofe of this, in those his learned and elaborate treatises*, concerning Ecclesiasticall policy, *as* 1. *From the* ground *of this combination of Churches, which is love, not obedience.* 2. *From the* forme *of it, which is communion and consociation, &c.* 3. *From the* matter *of it, which are Churches, who are æquall among themselves, as members in the body, which have a vicissitude of offices mutually to be performed, among themselves.* 4. *From the* object *of it, which is* res communis, *that which concerneth all the Churches in common.* 5. *From the* outward manner of proceeding, *which is* collatione consiliorum, *by conference and communication of counsells.* 6. *From the* end *of this combination, which is, not to receive the mandates of other Churches, but their consent, counsell and approbation.* ANSVV. In generall, it is

DeEccl. pol. l. 3. c. 22. p. 329.

is to be obſerved, 1. That the ſcope of Mr Parker in this chapter is to ſhew in what manner many Churches are combined together in Synods, namely as equals in a mutuall fellowſhip, and not with ſubjection to any one Church above the reſt. This he propounds in the beginning, as the ſtate of the queſtion; when he ſayth, (l) *The Hierarchy will have this combination to be ſubordinate and joyned with ſubjection unto their Hierarchy: againſt the common opinion of all Proteſtants, which affirme no conſociation to be lawfull, but that which is mutuall, ſuch as is wont to be among equalls.* He thought not therefore of this new found out combination, by ſuch as maintaine the ſingle uncompounded policie, but of ſuch as is commonly received by *all Proteſtants.* His arguments are all directed againſt the Popiſh and Hierarchicall combination, which we alſo diſallow with him. This he repeats againe for concluſion after his ſix arguments, ſaying, (m) *By all which it is plenteouſly demonſtrated, that the combination of Churches is not Hierarchicall, with ſubjection unto any one among the reſt, but rather Ariſtocraticall, wherein equalls are joyned together.* Neither could he call the government of Churches by Synods, Ariſtocraticall, if they did onely direct by way of counſell; ſeeing an Ariſtocracy is ſuch a government as exerciſeth juriſdiction in the judgement of cauſes. 11. If Mr Parkers meaning had bene otherwiſe, viz. that Claſſicall and Synodall combinations had no authority nor juriſdiction, or that no Churches ought to be ſubject unto the ſame; then had all his 6 arguments bene of no force, neither could they proove any ſuch matter. We may ſee it plainly in the example of the prime or particular Churches, where in the combination of many members together, though the *ground* of it be love; though the *forme* of it be communion; though the *matter* of it be brethren, which are equall among themſelves; though the *object* of it be *res communis*, that which concerneth all in common; though the *end* of it be, not to receive the mandates of any one member, but the conſent of many: yet doth it not follow hence, but that ſuch a Church and ſociety hath power of cenſure and juriſdiction, and that the members thereof are to be ſubject unto ſuch a combination. And thus alſo may particular Churches ſubmit themſelves to many, combined together in a Synod. 111. If Mr Parker did not meane thus, but ſimply denyed all juriſdiction of Synods & ſubjection of Churches unto them; then ſhould he be contradictory to himſelf, in that which he had ſo expreſſely and ſo often acknowledged in other places before: as that, *Greater is the power of a Synod, then of any one prime or particular Church*: and that *the Church that erreth and offendeth is ſubject to no one Church as to a Dioceſan, but to many aſſembled together in a lawfull Synod.*

(l) Pol. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 22. p. 327.

(m) Ibid. p. 336.

Moreover, to come more particularly to each of his 6 Arguments, there is ſomething to be obſerved in his reaſoning in every one of them, that may ſhew unto us how he acknowledged the juriſdiction of Synods.

I. The firſt Argument, (n) taken from the ground of love and mutuall help, is that which (he ſaith) is proved by *Zepperus, l. 3. c. 7.* (miſtaken for c. 8.) who in the ſame chapter, *pag. 715.* deſcribes the authority of Synods in the exerciſe of Diſcipline and the greateſt cenſures thereof, even unto *excommunication*, & therefore not for counſell onely. Againe, all thoſe places of Scripture, *Num. 32. 6, 17. Eccl. 4. 9. Rom. 12. 13. Phil. 2. 4. 1. Theſ. 5. 11, 14. Heb. 10. 24. & 13. 3. 1. Cor. 10.*

(n) P. 329.

33. which he together with *Zepperus* doth alledge for the warrant of this combination of Churches in Synods for their mutuall help, they are all of them such as doe equally, yea and primarily concerne the communion and society of severall persons and members in a particular Church, where it is confessed by our opposites that there is jurisdiction as well as counsell. If these places would have removed jurisdiction from Synods, and condemned the subjection of Churches unto a Synod; then would they also have done the like for particular Churches, and have condemned the subjection of members thereunto. Seeing they doe not the one, therefore not the other also.

(o) P. 330, 331. II. In prosequuting his 2d Argument, (o) taken from the *forme* of combination, which is consociation consisting in a mutuall obligation, he confirmeth it by the testimony of D. *Whitaker*, alledging that *Calvine sayd well, that by brotherly charity, not by naked authority, but by letters and admonitions and other such meanes Heretickes were deposed in the time of* Cyprian. Deposition of Hereticks was an act of jurisdiction in Synods. And againe, alledging *Mat.* 18. as the fountaine of this combination, he sayth, *Many Churches are combined after the same manner, that the prime Churches grow together into one body in their members*: and therefore it must be confessed, that as *Mat.* 18. is a ground of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in particular Churches, so is it also for Synods.

Cont. 4. qu. 4. p. 448.

(p) P. 331, 332. III. Mr Parker for confirmation of his 3d Argument, (p) taken from the *matter* of this combination, which are the severall Churches, equall members of one body, alledgeth the example of the Reubenites, who when they would expresse their combination with the Tribes on this side Iordan, do call it their *part in the Lord*, which was not unequall because of the distance of place. *Ios.* 22. 24, 25--- 28. And from hence then it may appeare, that as the Tribes of Israel equally combined together were not subject to any one Tribe apart, and yet were each of them subject to the whole society and body of Israel: so the particular Churches having each of them equall part in the Ecclesiasticall consociation of Classes and Synods, though they be not subject to any one Church apart, that is exalted above the rest, yet may be subject to the whole society of many Churches concurring together in Synods.

(q) P. 332, 333. IV. In the explication of his 4th Argument, (q) taken from the *object*, which is a common matter, concerning all or many Churches, he alledgeth a distinction (r) maintained by D. *Rainolds*, betwixt *questions* of the Church, requiring knowledge onely, and *causes* of the Church, requiring jurisdiction also for the judging of them. *Questions* of the Church were sent unto them that had no jurisdiction over those that propounded them: but the *causes* of the Church, not so: They in Africa were (f) forbidden to appeale unto them beyond sea; viz. for the decision of their *personall causes*, which yet were to be judged by the Synods in Africa: whereby it is acknowledged that Synods have a power of jurisdiction, which is more then counsell. Whereas Mr P. addeth, *The first combination of Churches is in matters of faith, &c. The second combination of Churches is in personall causes, yet by accident onely. for these properly belong unto each severall Church, as they are proper: yet when they become publick by accidents, then Churches are combined indeed, but with-*

(r) Conf. with Hart. c. 8. d. 5.

(f) Concil. Carthag. Græc. c. 28 & Milevita. c. 22.

without subjection, as it fell out in Cyprians time in causa lapsorum, *in the cause of them that fell [in time of persecution] which thereupon became publick, because the offence was common in many Churches*: Left any should stumble at these his words, it is to be considered, that as personall causes and offences are by accident the object of Classicall and Synodall judgements; so by like kinde of accident they are the object of that judgement and jurisdiction which is exercised by particular Churches. In that maine ground of Ecclesiasticall discipline, *Mat.* 18.15, 16, 17. all the degrees of admonition and censure are ordained to be used according to those 4 accidentall *ifs*; *If thy brother sinne*; *If he will not heare thee*; *If he will not heare the witnesses*; *If he will not heare the Church*: And so in like manner, those 4 limitations before noted by Mr Parker, are 4 accidentall cases, wherein the power of Synods is to be exercised, and wherein it is greater then the authority of particular Churches, viz. *if it be a common cause; if the Church be unable; if the Church administer unlawfully, if it be so presumed.* Such kindes of accidents are properly the lawfull and just object of Classicall and Synodall jurisdiction, by proportion from the same rule, *Matt.* 18. If one member sinne or suffer, it becomes a common cause so farre as it is knowne, all the members suffer with it and take care for the redresse of it, in a particular Church: 1. *Cor.* 12.25,26. And if one Church sinne & be in danger, it becomes a common cause; all the Churches that are members of the same body, especially those that are united by covenant in a Classicall and Synodall government are to take care for it, and to seek help according to the quality of the danger. Thus the community of cause inferreth combination. And further, for that which he repeats againe, that this combination of Churches by accident, is *without subjection*, it is still to be remembred that his meaning is, without subjection *to any one above the rest*: for so he againe largely explaines himself in the same place, giving instance in the Church of Carthage and in Cyprian the Bishop thereof, maintayning against *D. Downam*, that Cyprian was no Metropolitane, that the province was others as well as his, that in the Synod there held there was a parity, that the Churches were equally combined without subjection to any one, that Bishops & Elders had equall power in giving their suffrages.

V. In setting downe the 5t Argument, (t) taken from the *outward manner of proceeding*, which was by conference and communication of counsels, he shewes withall, that therein there was an exercise of jurisdiction, when as in the words of Cyprian he shewes the end of those counsels, *ut communi consilio sua figerentur sententiæ; that by common consent firme decrees might be made.* And the authority of these judiciall sentences and decrees touching those that were fallen, is further declared by Cyprian, when he shewes, that they were (v) *tempered with discipline and mercy*; whereby it is evident that there was an exercise of discipline or Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction therein: and that Epistle of Cyprian containes in it sundry other sentences, which shew that he spake of the administration of censure, and not of counsell onely.

(t) P. 334.

(v) Cypriã. L. 1. Ep. 8.

VI. In his last Argument, (x) taken from the *end* of this combination, which was *not to receive mandates, but for consent, counsell and approbation*; he saith it followeth hence that *no one Church was superiour unto others, but all were equall among themselves.*

(x) P. 335.

ſelves. This he declares by inſtance in the Church of Rome, which though in ancient time it was of great eſtimation and dignity, yet had it no ſpeciall authority and juriſdiction above other Churches, as he ſhewes by the teſtimonies of *D. Rain. Whitak. and Iunius.* But he doth not collect thence, that many Churches concurring together in Synods doe want authority to judge, and to give definitive ſentences in the cauſes brought unto them. Yea the contrary is manifeſt: for whereas *Bellarmine* perverting the teſtimony of the *Magdeburgenſes*, who had ſayd that the unity of faith might be preſerved by the conſociation of Churches which mutually were to help one another, objecteth, (y) *Non ſat eſt conſilium: imperium requiritur; Counſell is not ſufficient, but authority is required:* Mr Parker in this (z) ſame chapter alledgeth, alloweth and commendeth the anſwer which *D. Whitaker* (a) giveth unto *Bellarmine*, viz. *Conſenſum multorum non minus habere imperii quam unius voluntatem. Sic olim Hæretici per Synodos refutati, et alii in eorum locum ſuffecti. Quid amplius poſtulas? aut quæ melior ratio excogitari poteſt conſervandæ pacis? &c.* that is, *The conſent of many, hath no leſſe authority then the will of one. Thus have Hereticks bene refuted of old time, and others put into their places. What doe you require more? or what better way of preſerving peace can be thought upon? &c.* Or what plainer teſtimony can Mr Dav. require for the juriſdiction of Synods? They doe not anſwer Bellarmine that counſell alone is ſufficient, but plead for authority and power, ariſing from the conſent of many. *Iunius* alſo anſwereth this objection of Bellarmine in like manner, and ſayth concerning the power of Synods, (b) *Et eſt revera imperium Chriſti: qui primum jubet per Apoſtolum*, ut ſpiritus Prophetarum Prophetis ſubjiciantur; *deinde vero remedium adhibet*, 1. Cor. 11. 16. quod ſi cui contentioſum eſſe videtur, nos ejuſmodi conſuetudinem non habemus, neque Eccleſiæ Dei. *There is indeed the power of Chriſt, who firſt commands by the Apoſtle*, that the ſpirits of the Prophets be ſubject to the Prophets; *and then addeth the remedy*, 1. Cor. 11. 16. that if any liſt to be contentious, we have no ſuch cuſtome, nor the Churches of God. And Mr Parker in the ſame place, reaſoning in like manner, confirmeth his anſwer and enforceth it, ſaying, *What, I pray you, can be anſwered to this laſt reaſon? for the Apoſtle Paul referreth us from the contentions of any one Church unto many; whoſe example if it prevaile much, how much more their ſentence, when they are aſſembled together in a Synod?*

(y) DeRom. Pon. l. 1. c. 9
(z) P. 327.
(a) DeRom. Pont. Cont. 4. qu. 1. p. 49
(b) Anim. adv. in Bellarm. Contr. 3. l. 1. c. 9. n. 74.

HAving anſwered theſe Allegations of Mr Dav. we may now ſee what wrong he hath done to *Mr Parker*, in perverting his words and meaning, and making him a Patrone of this erroneous opinion that is ſo prejudiciall to the Church of God in the government thereof by Synods: and yet for the further clearing of the trueth and vindicating of *Mr Parker*, and for the help of the Reader, that he may better underſtand his meaning touching Claſſes and Synods, (for many have not his booke, and many underſtand it not, being written in Latine) I will ſet downe his judgement more particularly, touching the divers kindes and degrees of conſociation of Churches, with the ſpeciall queſtions touching Synods, and ſhew withall how he applyes the ſame to the practiſe of the Reformed Churches for the defence thereof, in all which the juriſdiction of Synods is maintained. And

Firſt,

First, comming to speak of the kindes of conjunction, or consociation, and shewing (c) that some are more imperfect by way of *Communication*, & some more perfect by way of *Combination*; *The Combinations* (he sayth) *are of two sorts: for some communicate among themselves by Letters onely, and some both by letters & messengers*, or Delegates. These communicatory letters were called in old time *Pacificall & Synodall* letters, and *Formatæ*. And he (d) alledgeth divers examples both from the Scripture and from the primitive Church, touching this kinde of communication by letters. And howsoever he notes from the *Magdeburgenses*, that this communication by letters did not proceed from dominion and subjection, &c. yet this is to be understood, touching the subjection of any one Church to another, and not of subjection to many Churches: for so he expounds himself touching this particular of communication by letters, as he had often done before in generall. For whereas it is objected, If all Congregations be equall, what shall be done in case of Schisme and Heresy, when there is no Synod nor Christian Magistrate? He answers, (e) *The time scarsely falles out, when no Synods can be had: or if Synods be wanting, yet Churches may communicate together by letters: and although there be no authority in one Church above another; yet many Churches joyned together, either in a Synod, or by letters, have authority over one Church offending.* And in the next page (f) againe, *alwayes every one Church is subject to many Churches.* And thus he expresly avoucheth a jurisdiction of many Churches over one, even in their communication by letters. And yet more particularly he applyes this to the present practise of the Reformed Churches, & highly commendeth the same, saying, (g) *And now in the Reformed Churches the necessary use of Elderships is acknowledged*, ubi communicatio per literas primæva purissime floret; *where the primitive communication by letters doth flourish in greatest purity.*

I.

(c) Poli. Eccl. l. 3. c. 22. p. 336.

(d) P. 337.

(e) Ibid. c. 21. p. 324.

(f) P. 325.

(g) Ibid. c. 22. p. 337.

Againe, Mr Parker proceedeth in describing the consociation of Churches, and sayth, (h) *The second communication of Churches followeth, when some deale with others concerning any Ecclesiasticall busines, not by letters onely, but by messengers also. This consideration is of great moment: for unto whomsoever this handling of Ecclesiasticall businesses doth belong, to them also of necessity doth belong the rest of the Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction.* This he often repeateth, but most fully, when speaking of the authority of sending messengers or Delegates, he saith, (i) *The power of sending Delegates in Ecclesiasticall affaires was not in any one Bishop, but in the Church it self, and therefore all the other jurisdiction.* Now it is evident that the Synod at Ierusalem did send Delegates in an Ecclesiasticall businesse, *Act.* 15. 25, 26, 27. and therefore according to Mr Parker, did not onely consult & admonish, but also exercised jurisdiction therein, and had the power of all other jurisdiction. Thus the Reformed Churches doe dayly practise: their Classes and Synods doe upon occasion send their Deputies unto particular Churches to judge, compound and decide the controversies that arise in the same; and according to Mr Parker doe exercise a lawfull jurisdiction herein.

II.

(h) Ibid. p. 338.

(i) P. 342.

From this *Communication* of Churches, he commeth to speak (k) of their *Combination*, from whence ariseth a *combined Church*, derived from other Churches. This combination he notes to consist either of two, or more Churches. An instance

III.

(k) Ibid. c. 23. p. 345. 340.

ſtance of this combination of two, he gives in the Synod at Ieruſalem, *Act.* 15. and ſayth, *It was a Councell and Synod, and that properly, and that of two Churches, to wit, of Antioch and Ieruſalem, for the Meſſengers ſent from Antioch were preſent, which repreſented the Church of Antioch, as is uſuall in Councels.* And notwithſtanding an objection made againſt the Church of Antioch, yet he ſayth that Church was alſo judge in that Councell, *becauſe their Meſſengers brought the judgement of the ſame with them.* Hereupon he reproveth two Spirits of errour, the one of *Grotius*, who ſayd to *reject the uſe of Synods altogether: for who would write this* (ſaith Mr Par.) *he that is bewitched with errour? ſeeing the Church of God hath alwayes held, that S... are here inſtituted of God to endure for ever, &c.* The ſecond ſpirit of errour which he reproves is that of the *Hierarchy*, (l) becauſe they condemne the *Reformed Synods*, as if they were degenerate, *quæ tamen ad hunc typum accuratiſſime efformantur; which are notwithſtanding moſt exactly framed according to this patterne.* Hence it appeareth that Mr Parker held the Synods of divine inſtitution to be not onely for counſell and admonition, but for juriſdiction alſo: for otherwiſe he could not have ſayd with truth, that the Reformed Synods, all which exerciſe juriſdiction, doe anſwer exactly thereunto; otherwiſe he might rather have ſayd, that the Synods of the Reformed Churches, ſwarving from the primitive patterne, were indeed adulterate and degenerate, uſurping authority and juriſdiction which did not belong unto them.

(l) P. 347.

IV. The combination of more Churches, Mr Par. deſcribes in divers kindes or degrees alſo: (m) and firſt that which is of many Churches into one Elderſhip. The reaſon of this is, becauſe ſome little Churches knowing their owne weaknes, doe joyne themſelves unto the neighbour Churches, and ſo make but one Elderſhip onely among themſelves. He gives an inſtance of this in thoſe ſmall Churches about Geneva, which not being ſufficient for themſelves, doe joyne themſelves unto the Church in the next City, ſo that they come together weekly into the neighbour-Conſiſtory of the City. This combination of leſſer Churches into one Elderſhip or Conſiſtory, Mr Parker approves and juſtifyes, and declares his judgement touching this kinde of conſociation. 1. He ſayth, *It is grounded upon the communion of Churches, and derived from the wiſedome of the Spirit*; and complaines of the Hierarchy that doe ſo virulently impugne the ſame. 2. (n) Whereas nothing is more objected againſt the Reformation in England, then that many Churches or Pariſhes are unable for it, wanting fit men to governe and to exerciſe diſcipline in Elderſhips: Mr Parker anſwereth hereunto; *If it be ſo, let them joyne themſelves unto the next Elderſhip; or erect a common Elderſhip among themſelves; and ſo from common counſell and help let them ſeek remedy for their weaknes.* Now it is recorded (o) that in the Diſcipline at Geneva, the right of Excommunication is in the power of this Conſiſtory or common Elderſhip: and hereby then it appeares that all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is not limited unto a particular Church onely; and that Mr Parker allowing of this government at Geneva, is not againſt the juriſdiction of many Churches over one. Againe, whereas D. Bancroft and D. Field object that the Churches at Geneva, and the villages of the Netherlands, have not the power of Excommunication; and whereas my oppoſites complaine, that Churches

(m) Ibid.

(n) P. 348.

(o) Calvin. Epiſt. 167.

thes are brought into bondage, and looſe their liberty, when they may not excommunicate without the conſent of others; Mr Parkers anſwer is, (p) that *the power of Excommunication, ordination, and other juriſdiction remaines pure in them, ſaving that communion which ought to be among Churches; every Church in greater matters uſeth the conſent and counſell of her neighbours, as of the Claſſis or Elderſhip in the City*, quod ego Eccleſiis vel perfectiſſimis non indignum reor, *which I judge* (ſaith he) *not to be unmeet even for the moſt perfect Churches*. Thus he requires not onely counſell, but conſent of other Churches in weightier matters; which is that we ſtand for. This doth not, as he ſaith, (q) import any Hierarchicall ſubjection in the pariſhes at Geneva, unleſſe happily any can be ſubjected unto himſelf; *for theſe pariſhes, each for their part, and that equally, are this very Elderſhip. What ſubjection is it, where all as well City-churches as the Country-churches are equall? for the country-churches are no more ſubject unto this Elderſhip, then are the city-churches.* (p) P. 349. (q) P. 390.

V.

The next combination of many Churches, which Mr Parker ſpeaks of, (r) is when they are united into one *Claſſis*. And of theſe he giveth inſtance in the Churches of the Netherlands; and in Scotland, where the 52 *Preſbyteries*, ſo called by them, were nothing els but ſo many Claſſes. For the warrant of theſe he bringeth both divers grounds of holy Scripture, and the example of antiquity. He there anſwereth 10 Objections made by the Hierarchy againſt theſe Claſſes. And it is to be obſerved that he doth not ſimply ſpeak of Claſſes in generall, but of theſe Claſſes of the Reformed Churches in theſe Countries, of our Claſſes, as he uſeth to call them, not onely for that he approved them, but becauſe together with us, he was a member of this communion, and lived under the juriſdiction of the Claſſis with us. If he had not allowed their juriſdiction, which he knew and ſaw to be exerciſed by them, how could he with good conſcience have praiſed them as he doth? Speaking of the ancient Diſcipline uſed in the Primitive Churches, he ſaith, (ſ) *Omnia hîc in politeia noſtra & in Claſſibus noſtris ſimilia. O quantum peccat Hierarchia, quæ hanc ſuaviſſimam Eccleſiarum combinationem eliminavit!* that is, *All things in our government and in our Claſſes are like unto theſe. O how much doth the Hierarchy offend, which hath baniſhed this moſt ſweet combination of Churches!* And as well might we cry out, O how much doe the authours of the ſingle, uncompounded policie offend, who likewiſe ſeek to baniſh and overthrow this combination of Churches in Claſſes; while they allow them onely for counſell, and regard not their conſent; but allow the Churches in combination to proceed in the weightieſt affaires, *without or againſt the conſent of Claſſes!* Whereas it is objected not onely by my oppoſites, but by ſome of the Hierarchy themſelves, that theſe Claſſes doe take unto themſelves that juriſdiction which they ſeeme to condemne in the Hierarchy; Mr Parker in his anſwer ſhewes the contrary: He ſaith, (t) *The ſuperiour power that is in Claſſes, ariſeth from the Churches, that are combined in Claſſes, &c. No Church hath dominion or preheminence over another.* He ſayth that *in the Metropoliticall or Epiſcopall juriſdiction, Churches have not their owne government, but are ſpoyled of their Elderſhips and ſubjected to the power of one, and to an externall Church, namely the Cathedrall. All which things are contrary in our Claſſes. Every Church injoyeth her owne government by her owne Elderſhip: the Claſſis, is no externall Church, much leſſe an exter-* (r) Ibid. c. 24. P. 353. &c. (ſ) P. 357. (t) P. 358. 359.

nall Court: for it consisteth of these Churches that are combined: so that here is no authority over many; the parishes doe joyne their authority together, and that equally.

VI. After the combination of many Churches into one Eldership and one Classis, (v) Pol. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 25. p. 362. Mr Parker proceeds (v) to speak of that combination of many Churches in many Classes, which is into one *Synod*, and that either Provinciall, Nationall, or Generall; the Nationall containing under it the Churches of sundry Provinces, and the Generall comprehending the Churches of many Nations. Touching Synods, he speaketh of the 7 controversies about them, and first of the *Necessity* of Synods. He sayth, he never knew any in the Reformed Churches to deny the necessity of Synods, before Hugo Grotius, that was the great friend of Arminius. He sheweth from Bogerman, that the Reformed doe stand for the necessity of Synods more then any other. Whereas D. Sutlive condemneth such as would have *statas Synodos*, Synods kept at certaine set times, and not onely extraordinary, as he saith that Synod of the Apostles was, *Act.* 15. (x) Mr Parker refuteth him, and argueth thus from that place, *This example of the Apostles sheweth that Synods are to be called, as the necessity and edification of the Church requireth: but there fall out so many abuses, errours, controversies, scandals and other such things; that set and frequent Synods are necessary: for the neglect whereof the English Hierarchy doth sinne grievously, which contenting it self with an extraordinary Synod onely, doth not call a Synod after the example of the Apostles, so often as abuses, errours, controversies, and scandals doe arise, but contrary to the example of the Apostles, committeth all these things to the care of one Bishop alone.* And whereas he addeth further in the same place, that *the Hierarchy is crept in in place of the Synod, taking violently unto it self those things which by divine right doe belong unto Synods:* he doth herein acknowledge the authority of Synods to be of divine right; for what els or what more doth the Hierarchy snatch unto themselves, then authority of censure, and jurisdiction in the judgement of Ecclesiasticall causes?

(x) P. 364. 365.

VII. Touching the second controversy about Synods, viz. the *authority* and power of them, (y) he notes that as there is an Aristocraticall government in Elderships: *so there is an Aristocraticall government by Synods*; and from this his assertion it followes, that as the Consistories or Elderships have a jurisdiction and power of government in them, and are not onely for counsell, so the Synods in like manner. When as he saith further, (z) that *the Synods borrow that authority which they have from the prime Churches*, this argues that he confesseth they have some authority; els how could they be said to borrow it? To like purpose he argues there againe, (a) *It appeares by the very obligation that Synods have their authority from the prime Churches: for otherwise Synods should not binde the prime Churches, unlesse by sending their Delegates they did avow their consent; unlesse they have just cause afterwards of dissenting.* Thus he acknowledgeth a bond of authority and an obligatory power in Synods: & as for the exception which he addeth, it is as well to be added unto any judicatory, either Civill or Ecclesiasticall whatsoever; for there is no jurisdiction nor authority of the highest Governours on earth, that ought to binde us unto the obedience of their decrees, if we have *just cause of dissenting.*

(y) Ibid. c. 26. p. 367.

(z) P. 368.

(a) P. 370.

VIII. For the *Convocation* of Synods, which is the third controversy, (b) Mr Parker doth maintaine and much commend the practise and order observed in these Refor-

(b) Ibid. c. 27. p. 371.

formed Churches, and declares at large what their manner is from divers acts of their Synods. He sayth, it is *cum sapientissime tum saluberrime instituta; a most wise & most wholesome institution.* He shewes, that the Church hath power of calling Synods; but where there is a Christian Magistrate, (c) *this power is regulated of the Magistrate.* He brings (d) 10 Arguments to prove that this power of calling Synods is not in a Metropolitane Bishop. He sayth touching Ecclesiasticall persons, (e) *The power of convocating is in no one, but in many; therefore Synods are not to be called by one, nor by the authority of one, but by the Synods themselves, by the precedent assembly itself, as is usuall in the Reformed Churches.* And speaking of *Act.* 15.6. he sayth, *Doth not this example binde all ages, that the meeting in Synods be by common consent, even as the Acts in the Synod are by common consent decreed?* This decree of calling together is an act of jurisdiction, more then counsell or admonition onely.

(c) P. 372. (d) P. 373, &c. (e) P. 375.

The fourth controversy about Synods is concerning the *Persons* (f) whereof the Synods consist. Whereas Bellarmine distinguisheth betwixt the greater & lesser Clerkes, and alloweth unto Hierarchicall Bishops to have *a deciding voyce*, and to the inferiour sort to have onely *a consulting voyce*, Mr Parker shewes at large that whosoever is lawfully deputed and sent, whether Ministers, Elders, Deacons, or any of the people, have a deciding voyce, and may give definitive sentence in Synods; and thereby he acknowledgeth the jurisdiction exercised in them. He saith, (g) *As the materiall foundation of Synodall right, is the excellency of inward gifts, not the dignity of any office: so the formall foundation thereof is delegation from the Church, from which whosoever they be that have receyved authority (and therefore Elders also) they have power of decreeing and judging in Synods.* And many other testimonies thereof he gives in that chapter.

IX.

(f) Ibid. c. 28. p. 379. &c.

(g) P. 387.

A fift controversy is about the *Præsident* or Moderatour in Synods. (h) Mr Parker labours to prove that this presidency doth not belong to an Hierarchicall Bishop or Arch-bishop, but maintaines the practise and order of the Reformed Churches, where the President of the Synods is elected or chosen by the Synods themselves. (i) *We argue first*, sayth he, *from the authority of the Church. for in Matt.* 18. *Ecclesiasticall authority is given primarily, and originally unto the prime Church: so that no rectour without the election and designation thereof, may challenge any authority unto himself. The Synod is a combined* or secondary *Church, which receiveth authority from the prime Churches: & that under the like condition, to wit that no rectour or Præsident be made without election of the Churches, which are combined in that Assembly.* This he declares at large and refutes the contrary arguments. Now this *Election of a Præsident* is an act of Ecclesiasticall authority, a part of the Churches power; and seeing this is confessed to be in Synods, it appeareth hence also that Synods are not onely for counsell & admonition, but also for the exercise of jurisdiction.

X.

(h) Ibid. c. 29.

(i) P. 402.

A sixt controversy about Synods concernes the *Execution of the Synodall Canons.* (k) Mr Park. holds that this belongs not unto any one Bishop or Arch-bishop, but unto particular Churches and their Elderships. He argues on this manner, (l) *The execution of Canons, of what kinde soever, whether they be those which are published of Christ, in the Scriptures, or whether they be ordained in Synods according to the Scriptures, is a part of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, a part of the exercise of the Keyes, as the Parisians call it. But*

XI.

(k) Ibid. l. 3 c. 30.

(l) P. 428.

the

the Keyes and Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction are not given to one Biſhop, but are promiſed to the Church and Elderſhip, Mat. 16. and given unto them, Matt. 18. Therefore the execution of Canons, belongeth not unto one Biſhop, but unto the Church which importeth many. Now if the execution of Synodall Canons by an Elderſhip or particular Church be a part of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, and of the Keyes, then much more is the making of theſe Canons in the Synod: and then Synods have not onely liberty of giving counſell and admonition, but power of juriſdiction alſo, which Mr Daven. denyeth. This concluſion and inference is afterward noted by Mr Parker himſelf alſo; when as he addeth, (m) *Why ſhould not he be judge in the execution of Canons, who hath power of judging in the ſanction* or decreeing *of the Canons? &c.* And againe, *If it be not lawfull for them to execute the Canons, neither will it be lawfull to ordaine them: on the other ſide, if they have authority of making Canons, then have they authority to execute them; and that much more.*

(m) P. 432.

XII. The ſeventh controverſy about Synods, is concerning the *Conditions* (n) thereof. And among other conditions, Mr Parker (o) requires this for one, that there be *a common conſent*, or *a community of ſuffrages*: and he complaines of it as a great corruption when there is in Synods *a negative voyce* allowed unto Biſhops or Archbiſhops. He notes (p) that to be not without reaſon called *an Oligarchicall Synod, when things are not done by common conſent, but one maketh fruſtrate the conſent of the reſt.* Now if it be a violation of the Synods right and authority, when the generall conſent of the greateſt part is made fruſtrate by the diſſenting of one or of a few; then much more is the authority thereof violated, when as notwithſtanding the univerſall and entire conſent of the whole Synod, both of the Præſident, & of all the Deputies of all the Churches there aſſembled, yet by receiving this erroneous opinion of my oppoſites, the definitive ſentence of them all is made fruſtrate and diſannulled; as if they had no juriſdiction nor power of cenſure, but were onely to counſell or admoniſh.

(n) Ibid. c. 31.
(o) P. 452.
(p) P. 454.

AS that which Mr Parker hath written particularly touching the combination of Churches in Claſſes and Synods, doth ſufficiently ſhew his minde touching this controverſy, and that Mr Dav doth in vaine ſeek to ſhrowd himſelf under his ſhadow: ſo that which he writes more generally in defence of the Diſcipline practiſed in the Reformed Churches, where the authority and juriſdiction of Synods is maintained, doth ſerve for a more full declaration thereof. He laboureth to prove (q) by 10 Arguments, that the Church of England is bound to imitate the Reformed Churches in their Diſcipline; which yet, (if Mr Dav. his opinion were true, they ought not to doe, but rather to avoyd it & flee from it, as being an uſurpation of unlawfull power, whereby their people are kept in bondage under the undue power of Claſſes and Synods. In ſpeciall, Mr Parker following Mr Brightman in his expoſition of the Revelation, (r) ſaith that *in Philadelphia, which is the type of the Reformed Churches, nothing is reprehended, but all things are commended, and among the reſt, the diſcipline, which is noted by the key of David, Rev. 3. 7.* He ſaith, that *the Angel of the Reformed Churches ſtands in the Sunne, Rev. 19. 17. as being the naturall ſonne of the woman clothed with the Sunne. Rev. 12. 1.* that *the Reformed Churches are as the beautifull mountaine, the mountaine of Chriſts delights,*

(q) Pol. Ecc. lib. 1. c. 29. p. 84.
(r) Ibid. p. 84. 85. 86.

Rev.

Rev. 16. 16. *& the hill of precious fruits.* He ſaith againe, that *the Philadelphian Church is the type of the Reformed Churches; that it is commanded to hold faſt her crowne.* Rev. 3. 11. Now if Mr Parker did judge this rare and high commendation to be due unto the Reformed Churches, and that by divine warrant, by the teſtimony of the holy Ghoſt foretelling their eſtate and the purity of the Diſcipline obſerved by them; then was he not of Mr D. his minde. for then he ſhould have judged them not to be a free people, while the cauſes of particular Congregations are judged and determined by another ſuperiour authority in Synods: Then ſhould he rather have judged that their Churches wanted the *key of David*, and were deprived of their lawfull and proper priviledges and prerogatives, being ſubject to an Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction in the aſſembly of the combined Churches. And in ſumme, then ſhould he (according to Mr D. his opinion) have judged them to carry a yoke of ſervitude and ſubjection, to be caſt off with all ſpeed, rather then a *crowne* of lawfull liberty, to be held faſt by them: then ſhould he with Mr *Canne* (f) have taught them to complaine in the miſapplyed words of the Prophet, *Ier.* 4. 13. *Woe unto us, we are ſpoyled*; viz. by the authority of Claſſes & Synods.

(f) Churches plea, p. 74.

TO conclude, for the judgement of Mr Parker in this controverſy, there are few that did better know, or at leaſt had more meanes to know his minde, then I. The trueth is, when he came from Leyden, where he and Mr Iacob had ſojourned ſome while together, he profeſſed at his firſt comming to Amſterdam, that the uſe of Synods was for counſell and adviſe onely, but had not authority to give definitive ſentence in the judging of cauſes. But after much conference with him, when he had more ſeriouſly and ripely conſidered of this queſtion, he plainly changed his opinion, and profeſſed ſo much not onely unto me, but unto ſundry others upon occaſion; ſo that ſome of Mr Iacobs minde were offended with him, and expoſtulated not onely with him, but with me alſo, as being an occaſion of altering his judgment. I had meanes to underſtand his minde aright, and better then thoſe that doe ſo many wayes pervert his meaning, he being not onely a member of the ſame Church, but a member of the ſame family & living under the ſame roofe with me; where we had continuall and daily occaſion to talk of theſe things, and at that time when Mr Iacob publiſhed his unſound writings touching this queſtion. He being afterwards alſo a member of the ſame Elderſhip, and by office ſitting with us dayly to heare and judge the cauſes of our Church, and ſo becomming a member of our Claſſicall combination, yet did he never teſtify againſt the *undue power* of the Claſſis, or complaine that we were not *a free people*, though the Claſſis exerciſed the ſame authority then, as now it doth. Yea he being alſo for that time the Scribe of our Conſiſtory, the Acts of our Elderſhip and Church being recorded with his owne hand, are extant to ſhew his agreement with us in the government of this Church. And it appeares hereby that he was of another ſpirit and judgement, then Mr Davenp. who hath publiſhed ſo many vaine cavills againſt the government and diſcipline of theſe Reformed Churches, and this under the cloake & pretence of his agreement with Mr Parker. Yea and further it is apparent that the knowledge and experience which Mr Parker got by this his living here in communion with theſe Churches, hath

the Keyes and Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction are not given to one Biſhop, but are promiſed to the Church and Elderſhip, Mat. 16. and given unto them, Matt. 18. Therefore the execution of Canons, belongeth not unto one Biſhop, but unto the Church which importeth many. Now if the execution of Synodall Canons by an Elderſhip or particular Church be a part of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, and of the Keyes, then much more is the making of theſe Canons in the Synod: and then Synods have not onely liberty of giving counſell and admonition, but power of juriſdiction alſo, which Mr Daven. denyeth. This concluſion and inference is afterward noted by Mr Parker himſelf alſo; when as he addeth, (m) *Why ſhould not he be judge in the execution of Canons, who hath power of judging in the ſanction* or decreeing *of the Canons? &c.* And againe, *If it be not lawfull for them to execute the Canons, neither will it be lawfull to ordaine them: on the other ſide, if they have authority of making Canons, then have they authority to execut them; and that much more.*

(m) P. 432.

XII. The ſeventh controverſy about Synods, is concerning the *Conditions* (n) thereof. And among other conditions, Mr Parker (o) requires this for one, that there be *a common conſent*, or *a community of ſuffrages*: and he complaines of it as a great corruption when there is in Synods *a negative voyce* allowed unto Biſhops or Archbiſhops. He notes (p) that to be not without reaſon called *an Oligarchicall Synod, when things are not done by common conſent, but one maketh fruſtrate the conſent of the reſt.* Now if it be a violation of the Synods right and authority, when the generall conſent of the greateſt part is made fruſtrate by the diſſenting of one or of a few; then much more is the authority thereof violated, when as notwithſtanding the univerſall and entire conſent of the whole Synod, both of the Præſident, & of all the Deputies of all the Churches there aſſembled, yet by receiving this erroneous opinion of my oppoſites, the definitive ſentence of them all is made fruſtrate and diſannulled; as if they had no juriſdiction nor power of cenſure, but were onely to counſell or admoniſh.

(n) Ibid. c. 31.
(o) P. 452.
(p) P. 454.

AS that which Mr Parker hath written particularly touching the combination of Churches in Claſſes and Synods, doth ſufficiently ſhew his minde touching this controverſy, and that Mr Dav doth in vaine ſeek to ſhrowd himſelf under his ſhadow: ſo that which he writes more generally in defence of the Diſcipline practiſed in the Reformed Churches, where the authority and juriſdiction of Synods is maintained, doth ſerve for a more full declaration thereof. He laboureth to prove (q) by 10 Arguments, that the Church of England is bound to imitate the Reformed Churches in their Diſcipline; which yet, (if Mr Dav. his opinion were true, they ought not to doe, but rather to avoyd it & flee from it, as being an uſurpation of unlawfull power, whereby their people are kept in bondage under the undue power of Claſſes and Synods. In ſpeciall, Mr Parker following Mr Brightman in his expoſition of the Revelation, (r) ſaith that *in Philadelphia, which is the type of the Reformed Churches, nothing is reprehended, but all things are commended, and among the reſt, the diſcipline, which is noted by the key of David, Rev. 3. 7.* He ſaith, that *the Angel of the Reformed Churches ſtands in the Sunne, Rev. 19. 17. as being the naturall ſonne of the woman clothed with the Sunne. Rev. 12. 1.* that *the Reformed Churches are as the beautifull mountaine, the mountaine of Chriſts delights,*

(q) Pol. Ecc. lib. 1. c. 29. p. 84.
(r) Ibid. p. 84. 85. 86.

Rev.

Rev. 16. 16. *& the hill of precious fruits.* He ſaith againe, that *the Philadelphian Church is the type of the Reformed Churches; that it is commanded to hold faſt her crowne.* Rev. 3. 11. Now if Mr Parker did judge this rare and high commendation to be due unto the Reformed Churches, and that by divine warrant, by the teſtimony of the holy Ghoſt foretelling their eſtate and the purity of the Diſcipline obſerved by them; then was he not of Mr D. his minde. for then he ſhould have judged them not to be a free people, while the cauſes of particular Congregations are judged and determined by another ſuperiour authority in Synods: Then ſhould he rather have judged that their Churches wanted the *key of David*, and were deprived of their lawfull and proper priviledges and prerogatives, being ſubject to an Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction in the aſſembly of the combined Churches. And in ſumme, then ſhould he (according to Mr D. his opinion) have judged them to carry a yoke of ſervitude and ſubjection, to be caſt off with all ſpeed, rather then a *crowne* of lawfull liberty, to be held faſt by them: then ſhould he with Mr *Canne* (f) have taught them to complaine in the miſapplyed words of the Prophet, *Ier.* 4. 13. *Woe unto us, we are ſpoyled*; viz. by the authority of Claſſes & Synods.

(f) Churches plea, p. 74.

TO conclude, for the judgement of Mr Parker in this controverſy, there are few that did better know, or at leaſt had more meanes to know his minde, then I. The trueth is, when he came from Leyden, where he and Mr Iacob had ſojourned ſome while together, he profeſſed at his firſt comming to Amſterdam, that the uſe of Synods was for counſell and adviſe onely, but had not authority to give definitive ſentence in the judging of cauſes. But after much conference with him, when he had more ſeriouſly and ripely conſidered of this queſtion, he plainly changed his opinion, and profeſſed ſo much not onely unto me, but unto ſundry others upon occaſion; ſo that ſome of Mr Iacobs minde were offended with him, and expoſtulated not onely with him, but with me alſo, as being an occaſion of altering his judgment. I had meanes to underſtand his minde aright, and better then thoſe that doe ſo many wayes pervert his meaning, he being not onely a member of the ſame Church, but a member of the ſame family & living under the ſame roofe with me; where we had continuall and daily occaſion to talk of theſe things, and at that time when Mr Iacob publiſhed his unſound writings touching this queſtion. He being afterwards alſo a member of the ſame Elderſhip, and by office ſitting with us dayly to heare and judge the cauſes of our Church, and ſo becomming a member of our Claſſicall combination, yet did he never teſtify againſt the *undue power* of the Claſſis, or complaine that we were not *a free people*, though the Claſſis exerciſed the ſame authority then, as now it doth. Yea he being alſo for that time the Scribe of our Conſiſtory, the Acts of our Elderſhip and Church being recorded with his owne hand, are extant to ſhew his agreement with us in the government of this Church. And it appeares hereby that he was of another ſpirit and judgement, then Mr Davenp. who hath publiſhed ſo many vaine cavills againſt the government and diſcipline of theſe Reformed Churches, and this under the cloake & pretence of his agreement with Mr Parker. Yea and further it is apparent that the knowledge and experience which Mr Parker got by this his living here in communion with theſe Churches, hath

bene a ſpeciall help unto him in the writing of thoſe learned treatiſes of Eccleſiaſticall policie, which for the ſubſtance and maine are as a lively Table wherein the government of theſe Reformed Churches is plainely pourtrayed before our eyes; his diſcourſe being as it were a narration and defence of their practiſe; which diſcourſe might yet have bene more perfect, had he lived to finiſh the ſame.

SECT. IV. *His Allegation of D. Ames examined.*

IO. DAV. *To theſe I might adde D. Ames in that which he wrote, in his latter time, wherein the Anſwerer pretendeth that he ſet downe his judgement more warily, in this matter, then formerly. See his Caſes of Conſcience, the 4. Booke, where he ſpeaketh clearly of this power, as eſſentially belonging to particular Churches.* ANSVV. Thus inſtead of Arguments from the Scripture for the confirmation of his cauſe, Mr D. ſtill leads us from one mans teſtimony to another, & thither I am forced to follow him. And for *D. Ames*,

Caſus cõſc. l. 4. c. 24. q. 4. & c. 25. qu. 5.

I. I may juſtly teſtify that I have found him wavering in his opinion, touching the authority of Synods. For through the inward familiarity which I had with him a long time, for more then 20 yeares together, while he lived in theſe countries, having oftentimes had earneſt conference with him touching this queſtion, and much complayning of the wrong done to many Miniſters by that booke entitled *Engliſh Puritaniſme*, which he had tranſlated into Latine, wherein there is ſuch a peremptory reſtraint of all Eccleſiaſticall authority unto particular Congregations; though he did never plainely retract that which he publiſhed, yet he ſhewed himſelfe divers times enclining to a change of his judgement, yea & ſometimes acknowledged that Synods had power to judge of cauſes, and by their ſentence to decree the excommunication of ſuch as had deſerved the ſame.

(t) Preface to Mr Par. book de Pol. Eccl. anno 1616.

II. For his writings; D. Ames when he (t) gave ſo great approbation of Mr Parkers work which he wrote of Eccleſiaſticall policie, wherein he doth ſo largely maintaine the power of Claſſes and Synods, might cauſe the Readers to think that he was of the ſame judgement with him, ſeeing he gives ſuch generall allowance and commendation thereof, without any exception about this queſtion.

III. It is to be obſerved that in none of his latter writings he doth uſe that peremptory phraſe, in limiting Synods, or Churches combined in Claſſes or Synods, *onely to counſell or adviſe*, in ſuch manner as was done in that (v) firſt writing.

(v) Engl. Purit. c. 2.

(x) Medull. SS. Theol. l. 1. c. 39. th. 27.

IV. And more particularly, in his Treatiſe of Divinity, he writes thus of particular Churches, (x) that *as their cõmunion requires, the light of nature, & equity of rules and examples of Scripture doe teach, they may and alſo ought frequently to enter into a mutuall confederation and conſociation among themſelves in Claſſes and Synods, that they may uſe common conſent and mutuall help as much as commodiouſly may be done, in thoſe things eſpecially which are of greater moment.* Now as in particular Congregations the greateſt acts of power and juriſdiction which are exerciſed therein, receive their ſtrength from *common conſent*, and doe conſiſt therein: ſo if in matters of greater weight the *common conſent* of Synods is to be uſed, then is a power and authority aſſcribed unto them; then ought not particular Churches to proceed without and againſt the au-

authority of common consent in Synods. And that *mutuall help* of other Churches is then most effectuall, whē there is not onely advise, but authority also to cōfirme the same. Though D. A. adde in the same place, that *this combination doth neither constitute a new forme of the Church, neither ought by any meanes to destroy or empaire that liberty & power which Christ hath left unto his Church, for the directing & furthering whereof it onely serveth:* this we also willingly grant. When a particular Congregation is hindred & stayed frō the exercise of their authority in an unlawfull businesse, in an unjust excōmunication or electiō their liberty & power is not hereby destroyed or taken away, but rectifyed and preserved. Here is to be remembred that which Mr Par. (as was noted before) sayth upon like occasion: when some objected that the Churches of the villages in the Netherlands wanted the power of excommunication, he replyes, (y) *Imo potestas excommunicandi, ordinandi, & jurisdictionis cæteræ illis illibata relinquitur, &c. The power of excommunication, ordination and other jurisdiction, remaines unto them uncorrupted, &c.* though they doe not proceed thereunto but with common consent of the Classis. (y) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 23. p. 349.

V. After this, D. Ames in his Disputation against Bellarmine touching Synods or Councels, doth sundry times acknowledge that they have more authority then onely to counsell and advise. This is to be observed in divers poynts: as first in the Question whether the greater Prelates onely have *jus suffragii decisivi*, the right or authority of a determining or definitive suffrage; or whether the same belong unto the Elders also, or inferiour Officers, to whom Bellarmine allowes a consulting voyce, but not a definitive. Here D. Ames according to the receyved opinion of the Protestants, (z) allowes unto them also the right and authority of suffrages, when they are deputed and sent as the Delegates of their Churches unto Synods. This he oft repeateth. And although he say (a) that *in matters of faith there is no judgement belongs unto men, but of inquisition, discretion & consultation, and that therefore that whole distinction betwixt persons defining and consulting is vaine:* yet it is manifest and undenyable that in the censuring of Hereticks that erre in matters of faith, there is an Ecclesiasticall judgement belonging unto men, and a definitive sentence to be pronounced against such. The matters of faith are as little to be subjected or submitted unto the judgement of a particular Congregation, as unto the judgement of Synods: and yet Hereticks are not to be exempted from the judgement and censure of either of them. D. Am. himself in the same place doth plainly acknowledge this distinction betwixt consultation and definitive suffrage; when he saith (b) *Bene consulere, majoris est virtutis, quam ex aliorum consilio bene definire, quamvis hoc sit majoris potestatis. To consult well is a matter of greater vertue, then from other mens counsell to define well, although this be a matter of greater authority.* Seeing therefore he confesseth that to have a definitive voyce is a matter of greater authority, then to counsell and advise; and seeing withall that this power of suffrages and definitive voyces belongs unto the Deputies of Churches in Synods, and that by his confession; it is evident that herein he ascribes more power unto Synods then he did in that book of English Puritanisme. (z) Bellarm. enerv. Tom. 2. l. 1. de Conc. c. 2. (a) Ibid. th. 8. (b) Ibidē.

Againe, in the question whether a Generall Councell be above the Pope, or the Pope above the Councell; although D. Am. in handling the same, doth not so ful-

fully and directly speak against Bellarmine, as D. Whitaker, D. Rainolds, Iunius, Sibrandus Lubbertus, Chamierus, and other of our Divines, which maintaine that the Pope may be justly condemned, deposed and Excommunicated by a Generall Synod; yet doth he (c) acknowledge the Councell or Synod to be above the Pope, in the very proposition of the question, and after takes upon him the defence of the Arguments commonly used by Protestant Divines for the proofe thereof. Would he have spoken plainly, according to the positions set downe in that booke of Engl. Puritan. & according to Mr Dav. his opinion, that limiteth all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction unto a particular Congregation onely; he should then have sayd, that as the Pope hath no power over a Generall Councell, so neither hath the Synod any authority over the Pope, either to depose, excommunicate, or any way to censure him, but might onely counsell and advise him &c. & he should as well have refuted the Protestants, for giving too much power to the Synod, as the Papists for giving too much power to the Pope. Now this he hath not done, but hath set down his minde in such manner, that neither the Papists against whom he disputed, nor the Protestants whose receyved opinion he seemed to maintaine, could easily observe any difference in him from our common tenent.

(c) Ibid. de Conc. c. 7.

VI. In another booke after this, he acknowledgeth (d) that *it belongeth unto Classes and Synods, when any difficulty is, to declare by common counsell and to decree, who ought to be excommunicated.* Now to decree an excommunication is an act of power, whereby judiciall sentences are determined, and in all propriety of speech, doth containe more in it, then a bare counsell or admonition: and therefore herein he doth apparantly give unto Synods more authority, then onely to counsell and advise. And thus D. Burges had reason to understand this speech of D. Am. which he alledgeth and approveth, and agreeably thereunto professeth; that *God hath established the use of* Ecclesiasticall Synods *for Church affaires as well as the gathering of Churches.* D. A. did either acknowledge the authority of Synods in this sentence, or els was too blame for deceyving his Reader with ambiguity of speech.

(d) Cas. Consc. l. 4. c. 29. q 9. th. 23.

(e) Rejoyn. p. 206.

VII. In his (f) last booke which he wrote immediately before his death, when he speakes of representative Churches, though he disallow that kinde of Synod or Convocation, which is sometimes kept in England, in respect of Hierarchicall Officers, and in respect of their imposing humane ceremonies; yet doth he not condemne the Synodall assemblies of Scotland, before Perth, nor the Reformed Churches of France, which have their association and combination without any Hierarchy. And yet it is undenyable & most certaine that those Synods of Scotland and France have used Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in censuring of notorious offendours, and were not onely for counsell and advise, as is further manifested hereafter. Had he dealt plainly and answered his opposite fully, he should have condemned the Assemblies of Scotland for that jurisdiction which (according to Mr Dav. his opinion and that booke of Engl. Purit.) they unjustly usurped. Yea further he doth justify those Synods; for whenas D. Burges (g) had spoken of such Ecclesiasticall Synods, as have jurisdiction and authority of censure, as appeares by his opposing of them unto other Synods, which the Separatists

(f) Fresh suit ag. Ceremp. 90, 91.

(g) Rejoyn. p. 206.

tiſts and Mr Iacob doe allow, which have no power to controle but *by way of brotherly admonition*; D. Am. in his reply unto that place, confeſſeth that D. Burges did ſpeak of (h) *right Eccleſiaſticall Synods*, and for the other Synods of Mr Iacob & the Separatiſts, the ſame that Mr Dav. allowes, he paſſeth away from them, and ſayth not a word in their defence, which yet had bene moſt pertinent unto the queſtion. (h) Freſh ſuit, p. 183.

VIII. As for thoſe places in particular which Mr Dav. alledgeth out of D. Ames his *Caſes of Conſcience*: for the (i) firſt of them, though it be ſayd there, that *the power of removing ſcandals and excluding the wicked, for the right thereof, and in reſpect of the firſt act, cannot be ſeparated from a true Church, becauſe it flowes immediately & neceſſarily from the eſſence thereof, &c.* this is not againſt us. for 1. When Synods judge the cauſes of particular Churches, they doe not take away their power, but onely reſtraine and correct the abuſe of their power; the authority of particular Churches is not ſeparated from them, but the corruption or fault that appeareth in the exerciſe of their authority. They are ſtill permitted to uſe their authority and judgement in cenſures, elections, &c. when the Synod perceives that they doe not goe aſtray therein. 2. Though there be a ſtreame of authority flowing immediately from the prime Churches, this hinders not, but helps and furthers the authority of Synods, unto which that power by delegation is immediately derived. And therefore as there is a fountaine of authority ſpringing out of a particular Congregation; ſo there is a Sea of authority in the Synod, where the waters of ſo many fountaines, and the authority of ſo many Churches doth concurre and meet together. As for that other place, *Caſ. Conſc. l.4.c.25.* it is anſwered hereafter in the Allegation that is taken from D. Voetius. (i) Caſ. cõſc. l.4.c.24. q.4.

Laſtly, for that (k) place which Mr Canne objecteth out of D. Ames, I acknowledge that there is ſomething more found againſt the authority of Synods, then in any thing that Mr Dav. hath alledged out of him. But all that D. Ames there writes is not eaſily to be admitted. For in that chap. the Queſtion being made, (l) *Whether whole Churches or members of another Church, may be excommunicated?* He anſwereth, *They cannot properly be excommunicated.* He bringeth 3 Reaſons. 1. *Becauſe every Church hath communion in it ſelf, out of which it can no more be caſt, then out of it ſelf.* But this reaſon is inſufficient, 1. Becauſe, though every Church hath communion in it ſelf, yet not onely in it ſelf, and with it ſelf, but with other Churches alſo: *Eph.* 4.4,5,6. 1. *Cor.* 12.13. and by excommunication it may be deprived and cut off from that comfortable fellowſhip, to the great grief, terrour and ſhame thereof, for their humiliation thereby, and for the warning of others. 2. Becauſe an obſtinate and rebellious Church, by a ſentence of excommunication may be caſt out of it ſelf, and deprived of communion in it ſelf either in the diſſolution of that unlawfull ſociety, while the Magiſtrate helpes to execute the ſentence; or otherwiſe in making their communion abhominable even unto their owne conſciences, by the hand of God working with his owne ordinance, in delivering them to Satan for the deſtruction of the fleſh, and depriving them of inward reſt, notwithſtanding any pretended ſecurity of the obſtinate. (k) Caſ. conſc. l.4. c.29. (l) Ibid. qu. 11.

His 2d reaſon is: *Becauſe the power of excommunicating flowes from ſome ſuperiority;*

but all Churches are constituted of Christ with an authority altogether equall. This is also a weak reason. for 1. Though all Churches be equall, and no one above another, yet many meeting together in a Synod, are superiour to one, as was shewed before by Mr Parker; (m) *Greater is the power of a Synod, then of any one prime and parishionall Church.* 2. When two Churches onely are by speciall covenant united together, as it may fall out necessarily upon occasion, though this combination be more imperfect, yet is this (n) reputed for a Synod: and though these Churches be in themselves equall, yet when one of them falles into errour & offence, then it becomes subject to the other, and the other hath authority over it to rebuke & censure the same. This is to be observed by proportion of two brethren, members of one Church: though both of them be in their estate equall; yet he that offendeth becomes subject to the other, who thereupon hath power over him, in a degree of binding and loosing, a power of loosing and *forgiving him, if he repent*, a power of retaining his sinne and binding him over to further proceeding, if he doe not repent. *Luk.* 17. 3,4. *with Matt.* 18. On this manner that generall commandement of mutuall subjection to one another (1. *Pet.* 5. 5.) ought to take place in two Churches as well as in two persons.

(m) Pol. Eccles. l. 3. p. 129.

(n) Ibid. p. 345. 346.

His 3d reason is, *Because the members of one Church, are neither subject to the government of another, neither doe they belong immediately unto the communion of other Churches, but by the communion of their owne Church comming betwixt.* The first part of this reason touching subjection, is answered before: and for the second part of it, there is no weight therein; for those that belong unto the communion of other Churches but mediately, are not therefore exempted from the jurisdiction and authority of them. And againe, the covenant of communion made at the first confederation of Churches for their mutuall government by a Synod, remaineth firme for the continuance and exercise of authority, either for or against some particular members of any one Church in that combination, although that Church unjustly violating their covenant, should refuse to consent or communicate with the Synod in their acts of Ecclesiasticall judgement and censure of some scandalous persons among them.

Moreover, that which D. Ames writes in the same chapter, may justly lead us to acknowledge the necessity of Synods, and their authority in the censure of offendours.

I. He addes in his answer to the same question, touching whole Churches & members of another Church, that though they may not properly be excommunicated, (o) *yet for manifest heresies or great faults, they may be condemned, forsaken, rejected, which is proportionable to excommunication.* If he grant this authority unto Synods, thus to condemne whole Churches, then he confesseth that they have more power then onely to counsell or admonish. If he grant this authority unto any other Ecclesiasticall persons, and not to Classes or Synods, the warrant from Scripture ought to be shewed. A censure proportionable to excommunication, requires an authority proportionable to theirs, that may excommunicate, for the exequution thereof.

(o) Cas. cōs. l. 4. c. 29. q. 11. th. 26.

II. In the same chapter, propounding this case of conscience, (p) *What is to be*

(p) Ibid. q. 10.

be done of the Paſtour, where a fit Elderſhip is wanting, or where the people doe not conſent unto a juſt excommunication? His reſolution is, *The ſolemne proceeding may be omitted: yet a good Paſtour ought to give all diligence hereunto with the reſt of the faythfull members, that the ſubſtance of the matter be ſo farre preſerved, that holy things be not given unto dogs & ſwine, Mat. 7. 6. and that all publick ſcandals be publickly reprooved.* But by this direction, neither is the peace of the Miniſters conſcience provided for, nor yet the ſafety of the Church. For by what warrant may a Paſtour by his ſole authority, determine and reject ſome members as dogs, and exclude them from the holy things, from the Sacraments, and this not onely without allowance of the Elderſhip, but againſt the conſent of the people and body of the Congregation, or the greateſt part of it? This is in effect an excommunication, or as he calles it, the *eſſence* or ſubſtance of the matter: for excommunication, greater or leſſe, is the onely Eccleſiaſticall judgement appointed of God to keep holy things from being given unto dogs. To permit this authority unto the Paſtour alone, is to open a dore for tyranny, and oppreſſion of the Church; and is condemned by thoſe 4 reaſons which he gives for confirmation of his anſwer unto the 9th queſtion immediately going before. It is the denyall of Synods, that drives unto ſuch extremities.

III. That which he here ſaith of *publick reproving all publick ſcandals*, is againe empeached by that which was ſayd before, (q) that *in thoſe Churches which through want of diſcipline are troubled with confuſion, it is not alway neceſſary for the perſon offended to admoniſh the offendour, becauſe he ſhould oftentimes in vaine beginne that which he had no power to finiſh*: that *the commandement of ſolemne admoniſhing of a brother offending, doth then onely binde, when there is ſome hope that the ſame will prevaile to take away the offence, either immediately or mediately. for a meanes is ſo farre good, as it makes to the obtaining of his end.* As though God did not bleſſe his owne ordinance above our hope and reaſon, above all that we can thinke: or as though we were not to uſe his meanes and leave the ſucceſſe unto him. He that begins a good work and proceeds ſo farre till he be ſtopped by others, is accepted of God as if he had finiſhed it. (q) Ibid. q. 4. th. 12, 13.

SECT. V. *His Allegation of Mr Baynes examined.*

IO. DAV. (r) *To him I may adde Mr Paul Baynes, a man of ſingular noate for learning and piety, in Cambridge, where he ſucceeded Mr Perkins, who freely expreſſeth his judgment for the right of particular Churches, and their independence, in this ſenſe, in his Dioceſans tryall.* ANSVV. As Mr Baynes was a man of ſingular note for learning and piety, ſo is his teſtimony of ſingular note to ſhew the right uſe & power of Synods, not onely for counſell, but for authority to cenſure and judge Eccleſiaſticall cauſes; ſo that particular Churches may not doe within themſelves, what they would without their conſent. (r) Apol. reply. p. 242. Dioc. tryal. p. 13. & 21.

I. After he had ſet downe 4 concluſions, wherein we agree with the oppoſites, he comes to ſpeak of the poynt of difference, and ſayth, (f) *That wherein we contradict one another, is, we affirme that no ſuch head Church was ordained either virtually or actually, but that all Churches were ſingular congregations, equall, independent each of other in regard of ſubjection. Secondly, we ſay, were there a Dioceſan granted, yet will it not follow, that Pariſh-Churches ſhould be without their government within themſelves, but onely* (f) Dioceſ. tryall, p. 13.

onely subject in some more common and transcendent cases. As it was with the Synagogues & that Nationall Church of the Iewes, and as it is betwixt Provinciall and Dioecesan Churches. This doe I willingly assent unto: And this is no other thing then that which is practised in these Reformed Churches, with whom we are united. Here is no one head-Church, that hath more authority then another, all Congregations are equall, independent each of other: here is no subjection to any one Dioceſan: all are equally and mutually subject to the Synod consisting of many: their dependency is not upon one more then another, but it is onely in regard of many combined; notwithstanding which combination they have their government within themselves: being subject to the Synod onely in some more weighty and difficult cases.

II. As for that other place; when some had pleaded from the example of the Reformed Churches, as if they had not bene distinct Churches, &c. Mr Baynes so explaineth their estate and practise (as Mr Parker (t) more largely had done before) that therein he doth not at all prejudice their subjection to Synods. for speaking of the 24 Churches at Geneva and of their combination and subjection unto one Presbytery, he sayth, (v) *They have power of governing themselves, but for greater edification, voluntarily confederate, not to use nor exercise their power, but with mutuall communication, one asking the counsell and consent of the other in that common Presbyteris. Secondly, it is one thing for Churches to subject themselves to a Bishop and Consistory, wherein they shall have no power of suffrage: Another thing to communicate with such a Presbytery wherein themselves are members and judges with others.* After that againe, he addeth, *Geneva made this consociation, not as if the Prime Churches were imperfect, and to make one Church by this union: but because though they were intire Churches, and had the power of Churches, yet they needed this support in exercising of it, and that by this meanes the Ministers and Seniors of it might have communion.* Thus he notes not onely the counsell, but the consent of others required. And as at Geneva a particular Church proceeded not without or against the consent of many Churches concurring by their Deputies in a common Presbytery: so in these Low-countries in weightier affaires they proceed not without or against the consent of many Churches concurring in their Classis.

(t) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 23. p. 348, 349, &c.

(v) Dioc. tryal. p. 21.

III. Mr Baynes having shewed how every Church being an Eccleſiasticall body, and having Governours every way equall, there is yet no feare of confusion, seeing Aristocracie, especially when God ordaines it, is a forme of government sufficient to preserve order; hereupon he propounds this objection, (x) *But every Church might then doe what ever it would within it self.* And hereunto he answers thus, *Not so neither; for it is subject to the censure of other Churches Synodically assembled, and to the Civill Magistrate, who in case of delinquencie, hath directive and corrective power over it.* And thus we have his expresse testimony and confession, that Synods have authority not onely to counsell and advise, but to *censure*; that particular Churches are *subject to the censure of other Churches*; that consequently there is a double Eccleſiasticall Aristocracie, one in particular Churches severally, another in many Churches Synodically assembled; that if a particular Church erre in matters of faith and religion, that it is subject, not to the power of *the Magistrate alone*, but both

(x) Dioc. tr. p. 68.

both to him and to another ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, ariſing from the combination of many Churches, contrary to that aſſertion in the Engliſh Puritaniſme, chap. 2.

IV. Speaking of Preſbyters, that is of Miniſters and Elders, and of their government, he ſaith, (y) *There is nothing found belonging to the power of the keyes* in foro externo, *but the Scripture doth aſſcribe it to them, power of ſuffrage in Councell, Act. 15. power of excommunication, which is manifeſt to have bene in the Church of Corinth, &c.* While he alledgeth *Act.* 15. for an evidence of the Preſbyters power in Synods or Councels, he doth hereby acknowledge that in Synods there is a lawfull exerciſe of juriſdiction and of the power of the keyes; and that therefore they are not onely for counſell and adviſe. To like purpoſe he ſaith afterwards againe, (z) *The Apoſtles did not offer alone to determine the queſtion, Act. 15. but had the joynt ſuffrages of the Preſbyterie with them. Not becauſe they could not alone have infallibly anſwered, but becauſe it was a thing to be determined by many; all who had receyved power of the keyes, doing it* ex officio, *and others from diſcretion and duety of confeſſing the trueth.* And a little after, he there addeth, *It is manifeſt by Eccleſiaſticall writings of all ſorts, that Preſbyters had right of ſuffrage, not onely in their owne Preſbyteries, but in Provinciall Synods, and therefore in Oecumenicall Synods, which doth ariſe from a combination of the other, to which their mindes went in the inſtruction of Biſhops receyved from their Churches.*

(y) Ibid. p. 67.

(z) P. 82.

V. Whereas one errour uſeth to accompany another, and commonly thoſe that deny the authority of Synods, doe alſo in part deny the authority of particular Elderſhips, as we ſee in the Browniſts, and therefore after private admonitions doe in a popular order referre the judgement even of leſſer matters unto the publick examination and deciſion of the whole Church aſſembled together, not permitting the ſame to the judgement of the Elderſhip; Mr Baynes doth alſo impugne this practiſe. For he ſpeaking of the rule of Diſcipline, *Matt.* 18. where Chriſt doth manifeſtly ſuppoſe the power of juriſdiction to be in many, yet after ſome other obſervations touching the meaning of the word *Church*, he further explaineth himſelf, when he addeth theſe notes and ſayth, (a) *Thirdly, as Chriſt doth ſpeak it of any ordinary particular Church indiſtinctly, ſo he doth by the name of Church not underſtand eſſentially all the Congregation. For then Chriſt ſhould give not ſome, but all the members of the Church to be governours of it. Fourthly, Chriſt ſpeaketh it of ſuch a Church to whom we may ordinarily and orderlie complaine: now this we cannot to the whole multitude. Fiftly, this Church he ſpeaketh of, he doth preſuppoſe it as the ordinarie executioner of all diſcipline and cenſure. But the multitude have not this execution ordinarie, as all but* Morellius *and ſuch Democraticall ſpirits doe affirme. And the reaſon ratifying the ſentence of the Church, doth ſhew that often the number of it is but ſmall:* For where two or three are gathered together in my name, &c. *whereas the Church or congregations eſſentiallie taken for teachers and people are incomparably great.* Againe, ſhewing on the other ſide that Chriſt by the Church doth not meane the chief Paſtour, who is virtually as the whole Church; and that the word *Church* doth ever ſignify a company, and never is found to note out one perſon; after other reaſons he pleades from the example and practiſe in the old Teſtament, ſaying, (b) *The Church in the old Teſtament never noteth the high Prieſt virtuallie, but an aſſembly of Prieſts ſitting together, as jud-*

(a) Dioceſ. tryall, p. 80.

(b) Ibid. p. 81.

onely subject in some more common and transcendent cases. As it was with the Synagogues & that Nationall Church of the Iewes, and as it is betwixt Provinciall and Dioecesan Churches. This doe I willingly assent unto: And this is no other thing then that which is practised in these Reformed Churches, with whom we are united. Here is no one head-Church, that hath more authority then another, all Congregations are equall, independent each of other: here is no subjection to any one Diocesan: all are equally and mutually subject to the Synod consisting of many: their dependency is not upon one more then another, but it is onely in regard of many combined; notwithstanding which combination they have their government within themselves: being subject to the Synod onely in some more weighty and difficult cases.

II. As for that other place; when some had pleaded from the example of the Reformed Churches, as if they had not bene distinct Churches, &c. Mr Baynes so explaineth their estate and practise (as Mr Parker (t) more largely had done before) that therein he doth not at all prejudice their subjection to Synods. for speaking of the 24 Churches at Geneva and of their combination and subjection unto one Presbytery, he sayth, (v) *They have power of governing themselves, but for greater edification, voluntarily confederate, not to use nor exercise their power, but with mutuall communication, one asking the counsell and consent of the other in that common Presbyterie. Secondly, it is one thing for Churches to subject themselves to a Bishop and Consistory, wherein they shall have no power of suffrage: Another thing to communicate with such a Presbytery wherein themselves are members and judges with others.* After that againe, he addeth, *Geneva made this consociation, not as if the Prime Churches were imperfect, and to make one Church by this union: but because though they were intire Churches, and had the power of Churches, yet they needed this support in exercising of it, and that by this meanes the Ministers and Seniors of it might have communion.* Thus he notes not onely the counsell, but the consent of others required. And as at Geneva a particular Church proceeded not without or against the consent of many Churches concurring by their Deputies in a common Presbytery: so in these Low-countries in weightier affaires they proceed not without or against the consent of many Churches concurring in their Classis.

(t) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 23. p. 348, 349, &c.

(v) Dioc. tryal. p. 21.

III. Mr Baynes having shewed how every Church being an Ecclesiasticall body, and having Governours every way equall, there is yet no feare of confusion, seeing Aristocracie, especially when God ordaines it, is a forme of government sufficient to preserve order; hereupon he propounds this objection, (x) *But every Church might then doe what ever it would within it self.* And hereunto he answers thus, *Not so neither; for it is subject to the censure of other Churches Synodically assembled, and to the Civill Magistrate, who in case of delinquencie, hath directive and corrective power over it.* And thus we have his expresse testimony and confession, that Synods have authority not onely to counsell and advise, but to *censure*; that particular Churches are *subject to the censure of other Churches*; that consequently there is a double Ecclesiasticall Aristocracie, one in particular Churches severally, another in many Churches Synodically assembled; that if a particular Church erre in matters of faith and religion, that it is subject, not to the power of *the Magistrate alone*, but both

(x) Dioc. tr. p. 68.

both to him and to another ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, ariſing from the combination of many Churches, contrary to that aſſertion in the Engliſh Puritaniſme, chap. 2.

IV. Speaking of Preſbyters, that is of Miniſters and Elders, and of their government, he ſaith, (y) *There is nothing found belonging to the power of the keyes* in foro externo, *but the Scripture doth aſſcribe it to them, power of ſuffrage in Councell, Act. 15. power of excommunication, which is manifeſt to have bene in the Church of Corinth, &c.* While he alledgeth *Act. 15.* for an evidence of the Preſbyters power in Synods or Councels, he doth hereby acknowledge that in Synods there is a lawfull exerciſe of juriſdiction and of the power of the keyes; and that therefore they are not onely for counſell and adviſe. To like purpoſe he ſaith afterwards againe, (z) *The Apoſtles did not offer alone to determine the queſtion, Act. 15. but had the joynt ſuffrages of the Preſbyterie with them. Not becauſe they could not alone have infallibly anſwered, but becauſe it was a thing to be determined by many; all who had receyved power of the keyes, doing it* ex officio, *and others from diſcretion and duety of confeſſing the trueth.* And a little after, he there addeth, *It is manifeſt by Eccleſiaſticall writings of all ſorts, that Preſbyters had right of ſuffrage, not onely in their owne Preſbyteries, but in Provinciall Synods, and therefore in Oecumenicall Synods, which doth ariſe from a combination of the other, to which their mindes went in the inſtruction of Biſhops receyved from their Churches.*

(y) Ibid. p. 67.

(z) P. 82.

V. Whereas one errour uſeth to accompany another, and commonly thoſe that deny the authority of Synods, doe alſo in part deny the authority of particular Elderſhips, as we ſee in the Browniſts, and therefore after private admonitions doe in a popular order referre the judgement even of leſſer matters unto the publick examination and deciſion of the whole Church aſſembled together, not permitting the ſame to the judgement of the Elderſhip; Mr Baynes doth alſo impugne this practiſe. For he ſpeaking of the rule of Diſcipline, *Matt.* 18. where Chriſt doth manifeſtly ſuppoſe the power of juriſdiction to be in many, yet after ſome other obſervations touching the meaning of the word *Church*, he further explaineth himſelf, when he addeth theſe notes and ſayth, (a) *Thirdly, as Chriſt doth ſpeak it of any ordinary particular Church indiſtinctly, ſo he doth by the name of Church not underſtand eſſentially all the Congregation. For then Chriſt ſhould give not ſome, but all the members of the Church to be governours of it. Fourthly, Chriſt ſpeaketh it of ſuch a Church to whom we may ordinarily and orderlie complaine: now this we cannot to the whole multitude. Fiftly, this Church he ſpeaketh of, he doth preſuppoſe it as the ordinarie executioner of all diſcipline and cenſure. But the multitude have not this execution ordinarie, as all but* Morellius *and ſuch Democraticall ſpirits doe affirme. And the reaſon ratifying the ſentence of the Church, doth ſhew that often the number of it is but ſmall:* For where two or three are gathered together in my name, &c. *whereas the Church or congregations eſſentiallie taken for teachers and people are incomparably great.* Againe, ſhewing on the orher ſide that Chriſt by the Church doth not meane the chief Paſtour, who is virtually as the whole Church; and that the word *Church* doth ever ſignify a company, and never is found to note out one perſon; after other reaſons he pleades from the example and practiſe in the old Teſtament, ſaying, (b) *The Church in the old Teſtament never noteth the high Prieſt virtuallie, but an aſſembly of Prieſts ſitting together, as*

(a) Dioceſ. tryall, p. 80.

(b) Ibid. p. 81.

judges in the causes of God. Wherefore as Christ doth indistinctlie presuppose everie particular Church: So he doth here onely presuppose the joynt authoritie, and joynt execution of a representative Church, a Presbyterie of Elders who were Pastors and Governours. And thus he concludes from *Mat.* 18. that there is a representative Church of one particular Congregation; as before from *Act.* 15. he acknowledged a representative Church in the Synod, for many Churches.

VI. Whereas *Mr Dav.* alledgeth out of *Mr Parker*, that *the power Ecclesiasticall doth essentially and primarily reside in the Church it self, as in its proper subject*: although this be no ground for the refutation of that power and jurisdiction belonging to Synods, as I have shewed (c) before; yet even this ground also is denyed by *Mr Baynes*, who goes not so farre as *Mr Parker* (d) touching the derivation of all Ecclesiasticall authority from a particular Church as from the fountaine, but doth (in some part) oppose that opinion, especially in respect of that influence of authority *per institutum*, viz. that which is in Ministers called immediately of Christ, as the Apostles were, yet in respect of the end and the whole, is sayd to be from the Church mediately, &c. And therefore though *Mr Parker* was farre from the opinion of *Mr Dav.* yet was *Mr Baynes* farre further from it. His judgement herein, as being worthy the consideration of the Readers, I have thought meet to set downe the more fully. And first, speaking by occasion of the power of *jurisdiction* in the Church, he sayth, (e) *Christ hath committed it* originaliter & exercitative *to the representative Church, that they might Aristocratically administer it.* And afterwards comming to intreat of the third maine question in his booke, (f) *Whether Christ did immediately commit ordinarie power Ecclesiasticall, and the exercise of it, to any one singular person, or to a united multitude of Presbyters*, he there sets downe his judgment more largely, in divers conclusions (g) on this manner.

(c) P. 89. 90
(d) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 8. p. 28. &c.
(e) Dioc. tryal. p. 69.
(f) Ibid. p. 98.
(g) P. 83. 84

„ *Conclus.* 3. Ordinarie power with the execution thereof, was not given to „ the communitie of the Church, or to the whole multitude of the faithfull, so „ that they were the immediate and first receptacle, receiving it from Christ, and „ virtually deriving it to others. This I set downe against the Divines of Constance; our prime Divines, as *Luther* and *Melancthon*, and the Sorbonists, who „ doe maintaine it at this day. Yea this seemeth to have been *Tertullians* errour; „ for in his booke *de pudicitia*, he maketh Christ to haue left all Christians with „ like power, but the Church for her honour, did dispose it as we see. The pro„ portion of a politick body, and naturall, deceived them, while they will apply „ all that is in these to Christs mysticall body, not remembring that *analogon* is „ not *in omni simile*, for then should it be the same with the *analogatum*. True it is, „ all civill power is in the body politick, the collections of subjects, then in a „ King from them: And all the power of hearing, seeing, they are in the whole „ man, which doth produce them effectually, though formally and instrumen„ tally they are in the eare and eye. But the reason of this is, because these pow„ ers are naturall, and what ever is naturall, doth first agree to the communitie or „ *totum*, and afterward to a particular person and part, but all that is in this body, „ cannot hold in Christs mysticall body. In a politick body, power is first in the „ communitie, in the King from them, but all Ecclesiasticall power is first in our

King

„ King before any in the Church from him. But to whom ſhould he firſt com-
„ mit this power, but to his Queene? *Anſw.* Conſidering this power is not
„ any Lordly power, but a power of doing ſervice to the Church for Chriſt his
„ ſake: therefore it is fit it ſhould be committed to ſome perſons, and not to the
„ whole communitie, which are the Queen of Chriſt. For it is not fit a King
„ ſhould commit power to his Queene to ſerve herſelf properly: but to have per-
„ ſons who in regard of this relation ſhould ſtand diſtinguiſhed from her. Second-
„ ly, in naturall bodies, the power of ſeeing is firſt immediately in the man, from
„ the man in the eye and particular members: In the myſticall body, the faith of
„ a beleever is not firſt immediately in all, then in the beleever, but firſt of all and
„ immediately in the perſonall beleever, for whoſe good it ſerveth more proper-
„ ly then for the whole, every man being to live by his owne faith. The power
„ of Prieſthood was not firſt in the Church of Iſrael, ſo derived to the Prieſt: but
„ immediately from Chriſt ſeated in Aaron and his ſonnes. *Object.* Yea they
„ were given the Church *intuitu ejuſdem tanquam finis & totius.* *Anſw.* I but
„ this is not enough, that power may be ſayd to be immediately received by the
„ Church as the firſt receptacle of it, and from it derived to others, as the power
„ of ſeeing is not onely given *intuitu hominis* as the end of it, and the *totum* to whom
„ it agreeth, but is *in homine* as the firſt ſubject from whom it commeth to the eye.
„ But the power even of ordinary Miniſters is not in the Church. For as all are
„ ſayd not to have been Apoſtles, ſo not to have been Doctors. But if the power
„ of ordinarie teaching had been given to every beleever, all ſhould have been
„ made Doctors, though not to continue ſo in exerciſing the power. Secondly,
„ were the power in the Church, the Church ſhould not onely call them, but
„ make them out of vertue and power received into her ſelfe: then ſhould the
„ Church have a true Lordlike power in regard of her Miniſters. Beſides, there
„ are many in the community of Chriſtians uncapable of this power regularly,
„ as women and children. This concluſion in my judgement *Victoria*, *Soto* and
„ others deny, with greater ſtrength of reaſon then the contrary is maintained.

„ *Concluſ.* 4. Fourthly, ordinary power of miniſteriall government is commit-
„ ted with the execution of it, to the Senat or Preſbyterie of the Church. If any
„ faile in any office, the Church hath not power of ſupplying that, but a miniſtery
„ of calling one whom Chriſt hath deſcribed, that from Chriſt he may have pow-
„ er of office given him in the place vacant.

„ *Concluſ.* 5. Laſtly, though the community have not power given her, yet
„ ſuch eſtate by Chriſt her huſband is put on her, that all power is to be executed
„ in ſuch manner, as ſtandeth with reſpect to her excellencie. Hence it is, that
„ the governours are in many things of greater moment to take the conſent of
„ the people with them. Not that they have joynt power of the keyes with
„ them, but becauſe they ſuſtaine the perſon of the ſpouſe of Chriſt, and therefore
„ cannot be otherwiſe dealt with, without open diſhonour in ſuch things, which
„ belong in common to the whole congregation.

Afterwards againe, (h) ſpeaking of ſome derivation of power from the Church, (h) P. 88.
in taking in Officers, he ſhewes that the Church doth this onely as an inſtrument,

in taking that perſon whom Chriſt deſcribeth and would have to be placed in this or that office: but hath not this power in herſelf either formally or virtually. And from this Stewardlike power of the Church, he declares that Officers in the Church are not to adminiſter in the name of the Church, but in the name of Chriſt: *As a Butler taken in by a ſervant, doth execute his office, not in maſter Stewards name, but in his maſters, who onely out of power did conferre it on him.* By theſe & ſundry other aſſertions, it is apparant that *Mr Baynes* was of a farre different opinion from *Mr Dav.* touching the ſtate of particular Churches, & the authority of Synods. Let us heare his next Authour.

SECT. VI. *His Allegation of the Replyer upon D. Downam examined.*

(r) Apol. reply. p. 242. Part. 2. l. 2. p. 104, 105. &c.

IO. DAV. (i) *With whom I might joyne the Replyer upon Dr Downams defence, who, not onely declareth his owne judgement herein concurring with the above mentioned, but alſo joyneth with them the ſuffrages of divers others, as the Centuriſts, Illyricus, D. Andrewes Biſhop of Wincheſter, Dr Fulke, Willet, Thom: Bell, Cyprian, Auguſtine, Gerſon, Ferus.* ANSVV. I. If this Authour did in his judgement concurre with the above mentioned, and in ſpeciall with Mr Baynes next above mentioned, as Mr Dav. affirmes, then did he allow the juriſdiction and authority of Synods for the cenſure of things done in particular Churches; then did he judge each Congregation to be *ſubject unto the cenſure of other Churches Synodically aſſembled.*

(k) Churches plea. p. 86. (l) Lib 2. par. 2. p. 104 (m) Lib. 1. part. 2. p. 22, 23.

II. This teſtimony of the Refuter of D. Downa. is alledged alſo, and more plainly by Mr Canne, who expreſſeth his words, and ſayth (k) *he often affirmeth,* (l) *that the adminiſtration of all Church-matters, at firſt was in every Congregation, the right in the Church, the execution in the Preſbytery thereof.* And beſides this, he alledgeth another place, where he ſayth, *For this purpoſe he inſtanceth Cenchrea* (m), *howſoever it was the Port of Corinth, and not farre from it, as Radcliffe or Lime-houſe to London, yet it was a diſtinct Church, from that of Corinth, and alike indued with full power of Eccleſiaſticall government.* But in all this, the juriſdiction of Synods is not denyed; as is manifeſt by a like inſtance here in theſe Reformed Churches. The villages of *Diemen* and *Sloten*, this on the one ſide and that on the other ſide of *Amſterdam*, and not farre from it, and in all appearance farre leſſe in compariſon of Amſterdam, then Cenchrea was in reſpect of Corinth, yet are theſe ſmall Congregations, diſtinct Churches from that of Amſterdam, & alike endued with full power of all Eccleſiaſticall government. That which Mr Canne by a *Note* in the margine would have ſpecially to be marked, may as well be obſerved touching theſe and many other little Churches hereabout, that they have in themſelves the adminiſtration of all Church-matters, and the execution thereof by their Preſbyteries, as fully and as amply as the Church of Amſterdam, or any other of the greateſt Churches in theſe countries, being alike combined together in the Claſſis, and equally ſubject to one another in the Lord for their mutuall guidance.

(n) Reply. par. 1. l. 2. p. 106.

IH. Even this Replyer upon D. Downam, Mr S. who now reſteth in the Lord, hath bene very carefull not to prejudice the authority of Synods, as may appeare further if we conſider what he anſwereth concerning thoſe whom D. D. calleth the *late Diſciplinarians*, ſuch as were of Mr Iacobs opinion. Firſt, he ſaith, (n) *As for Synods, if they be lawfully called, well ordred, and their conſtitutions by royall*

all-

authority ratified; the Doctour can give neither more honour nor obedience to them, then they doe, as their Protestation sheweth, Art. 8, 12, 13, 14. Now as for the present Synods, such as are in these Reformed Churches, they are such as he mentioneth here, called and assembled by authority of the Magistrates, and their Acts approved, confirmed and ratifyed by them. This may be seen in the Records of that Nationall Synod holden at Dort, Anno 1618. and 1619. where (o) the Decree of the States Generall, which are the soveraigne and supreme Magistrates in these countries, is inserted among the Acts of the Synod, for the ratification thereof. And this is not onely observed in Nationall Synods, but in the Provinciall Synods also, held every yeare, where the States have also their Deputies, Civill Magistrates, which ordinarily are present in those Assemblies, to see that all things be well ordered therein. Thus farre therefore, according to his relation, there is an obedience and subjection due unto Synods. Againe whereas he proceedeth to describe their opinion, on this manner; *If they want Regall authority to assemble or to ratify them; they thinke that by Divine or Apostolicall ordinance, their decrees or canons ought not to be imposed on any Churches, without their particular and free consents:* It is here to be observed how he notes onely what *they thinke*, without approbation thereof; he declares their opinion, but doth not acknowledge it to be his owne judgement. Neither had he reason so to judge: for in the primitive Church, when there were no Christian Magistrates, there was then a lawfull use of Synods, and that by Divine and Apostolicall ordinance, as hath bene shewed before. And as for *particular consents*: if any Church walked disorderly and offensively, there is no reason to think that the censures and decrees of Synods against such Churches should be differred untill they did consent unto the censuring of themselves. It was sufficient that at their first combination there was a generall and free consent, to submit themselves in the Lord mutually unto other Churches Synodically assembled. And yet more plainely, in the same place he professeth that he differeth in judgement from them, when he concludes, *Thus much shall suffice to be spoken in defence of those later Disciplinarians, from whom although in some things I confesse I dissent, yet I cannot consent to the D. taking away of their innocency.* Though in some things Dr D. did unjustly charge them, yet Mr S. the Refuter of D. D. did also judge that in some things there was just cause to dissent from them.

(o) Act. Synod. Dordr. Sess. 138.

IV. Besides the foresayd Refuter of D. Down. there is also another learned man, who besides his great learning having also as great experience in the discipline and government of the Church according to the practise of the Reformed Churches, hath of later time written a compleat and large refutation of D. Downam. And in this refutation he hath dealt more plainly and circumspectly in this poynt, then Mr S. hath done. For whereas D. D. relating the opinion of these later Disciplinarians, as new and false, sets downe their assertion in these words, (p) *That every parish by right hath sufficient authority within it selfe immediately derived from Christ, for the government of it selfe in all causes Ecclesiasticall*; this assertion is not admitted but with sundry cautions. To omit the rest, these are the two last, wherein the authority of Synods is evidently acknowledged; viz. (q) *The fourth caution is, that the authority given to a particular Church, is not sufficient for the handling of all Ecclesia-*

(p) Sermon at Lambeth, p. 4.

(q) Gerson Bucer. Dissert. de Gub. Eccl p. 14.

siasticall causes by their owne judgement, but for those onely which are so particular, that they may be deemed altogether proper unto it. For whatsoever case falles out belonging unto the common order of neighbour Churches, we judge that the same is to be brought unto a more generall assembly, wherein these Churches doe jointly meet together. The last caution is, that both the institution and observation of all things, especially if they seeme to procure any discommodity or not to make for ædification, be subjected unto the judgement of the next Churches meeting together in one. For we doe not permit, that the Governours of parishes should dispatch all things as they list, but will have them to submit themselves to the inspection of the Churches. For we think that of Augustine ought by all meanes to be observed: (r) Semper universum partibus jure optimo præponi; *that by good right the whole is alwayes to be preferred above the parts, &c.* Thus expressely hath this Authour given warning, that the whole combination of many Churches united in Synods is of greater authority then any part; that particular Churches owe a subjection unto the same.

(r) Aug. l. 2. de Bapt. in Donat. ca. 9.

Lastly, as for those many other Authours, the Centurists, Illyricus, D. Andrewes B. of Winch. D. Fulk, Willet, Thom: Bell, Cyprian, Augustine, Gerson, Ferus, whose names are here alledged by Mr Dav. without specifying their words, they are all of them, except one or two, alledged by Mr Canne, and in answer unto him (f) hereafter, it is shewed that all & every one of them are against Mr Davenp. his opinion, all giving a cleare and plaine testimony for the jurisdiction of Synods.

(f) Chap. 7. sect. 1. 2, 4. 6.

SECT. VII. *His Allegation of D. Voetius examined.*

IO. DAV. (t) *To the same purpose, hath a worthy and learned wrighter of these countries, Voetius, Professour of Divinity in Vtrecht, whose words I thus translate.* The „ Church is the spouse of Christ, which is the proper and adæquate subject of „ that power, to whom Christ hath committed that delegate right, reserving the „ chiefe to himself. Which ought to be and to remaine so proper to the Church, „ that it, neither may be snatched away by the authority of others, nor lost by „ their voluntary concession, nor committed to the trust of any other; although „ divers acts belonging to the calling of a Minister may & ought to be performed „ by certaine members of the Church. ANSVV. All that is here affirmed by this worthy Writer, being granted of us, yet is not Mr Dav. his opinion justifyed, nor the authority and jurisdiction of Synods overthrowne hereby. for,

(t) Apol. reply. p. 242, 243. Desp. caus. Pap. lib. 2. sect. 2. cap. 12. p. 186.

I. Christ was the Bridegroome of his Church, and the Church was the Spouse of Christ, and honoured with this title under the old Testament, as well as under the new: *Sol. song. ch. 1. & 2. &c. Esa. 50. 1. Ezek. 16. 8. Hos. 1. & 2. & 3. 1. &c.* And yet it is confessed by my oppolites that under the old Testament, before Christs comming in the flesh, particular Congregations and Synagogues were subject unto the Synedrion, and that all jurisdiction was not limited unto the severall villages or cities in Israel, or to the Synagogues therein. And therefore this title of *Spouse* and *Bridegroome* doth not inferre any restraint of jurisdiction in the new Testament more then in the old.

II. As when the Church of Antioch sent their Delegates or Deputies unto Ierusalem, and the controversy raised in their Church was decided and determined by the definitive sentence and decree of the Synod, *Act. 15.* they did not there-

thereby loose their power, but it still remained with them, for the judgement of their causes; so those Churches that now submit their causes to the judgement of Classes and Synods, are not thereby spoyled of their power: yea it is their owne authority and power which by their Delegates is exercised in those Assemblies. Moreover the Churches are herein so farre from loosing their power, that on the contrary they might be sayd to loose their liberty, right and power, if they had not authority for their owne help and others thus to send their messengers unto such assemblies.

III. It is to be observed how Mr Dav. doth mistranslate the words of *D. Voetius*, by omitting a word of speciall importance, which both he and *D. Ames* also (v) using the like speech, have expressely mentioned: for whereas their words touching the power of the Church and the propriety thereof, are these, *ut alienæ fidei planè committi non possit*, *that it may not altogether be committed to the trust of others*; he omitting this word *planè*, which signifyes *altogether*, *utterly*, or *quite and cleane*, doth hereby corrupt the testimony which he alledgeth. For though the Church may not utterly or quite and cleane commit her power to the trust of others; yet in some kinde and in some measure it may and ought to be done: For the kindes, *D. Voetius* gives instance in *divers acts, belonging to the calling of a Minister, which may and ought to be performed by some certaine members thereof*; and the same is to be considered for divers other acts of like nature: And for the measure, so (as he also notes) that Christ the Bridegroome, *reserve the supreme authority unto himself*; which is then acknowledged by his people, when they doe not receive nor follow the authority or sentence of any man or Officer, of any particular Congregation, or of any Synod, further then they in their consciences finde it to agree with the sentence of Christ revealed in his word. As the Lord himself by an immediate call committed power and authority unto the trust of his servants, whose faithfulnes is thereupon commended: 1. Tim. 1. 11, 12. 1. Cor. 9. 17. Gal. 2. 7. so doth the Church also, both in the ordinary calling of men unto office; and in the occasionall sending of them about particular workes and affaires of the Church; Phil. 2. 25. 2. Cor. 8. 19. 23. 1. Cor. 16. 3. & especially in communicating their power unto them, to give sentence in Synods.

(v) Cas. cōs. l. 4 c. 25. q. 5. th. 26.

IV. That *D. Voetius* doth allow the authority and jurisdiction of Synods, we have many testimonies out of this very book of his, which Mr D. alledgeth. 1. Though he shew that Ecclesiasticall power of judgement is first and immediately in particular Churches, yet he notes withall, (x) that *this power arising thence by a certaine fit proportion applyed unto many Churches united in some kingdome or kingdomes, or in the whole world.* This is done in National & Generall Synods. 11. Speaking of a publick Reformation, which he calles *authoritative*, he shewes (y) how it (being universall) may be done either *in an universall Synod, or without a Synod.* Speaking of Reformation made by instruction, exhortation, or invitation, he sayth it may be done of any one Preacher, yea and in some sort of any one Christian: but for the Reformation wherein there is *an actuall change of publick worship*, he saith, it is necessary that the help and consent of many, and those not of one order, doe concurre; and that *one or a few are not sufficient, unlesse it fall out that the authority and parts*

(x) Desp. cauf. Pap. l. 2. f. 1. c. 5. p. 96.

(y) Ibid. p. 62.

of

of those many who are interested therein, be devolved unto them. Thus he alloweth the jurisdiction of Synods, while he acknowledgeth that the authority of many may be derived and communicated unto a few; which is the very thing wherein the jurisdiction of Synods doth consist. III. He defends (z) Luther appealing from the sentence of excommunication given out by Pope Leo the tenth, unto a lawfull Generall Synod: he allowes the like appeale made by the Arch-bishop of Colen, and the appeale of the King of Navarre, and the Prince of Conde, the forme whereof was affixed or set up at Rome; in all which the authority of Synods is acknowledged. IV. He allowes (a) the example of those Churches, which determined matters *by a publick, and Nationall or Provinciall judgement.* Speaking of the Reformers of Religion, he sayth, (b) Luther had the right of suffrage, and used the same in the University of Witteberg, as one of the Professours; in the Church, as one of the Pastours; *in the neighbour-churches of Saxony, as a member of them, in the name and by commission from the Church of Witteberg, and not further. So did Zuinglius, Farell, Viret, Calvin, and all the rest.* A just patterne of the Classicall and Synodall jurisdiction exercised in the Reformed Churches in these countries at this day. V. He avoucheth and maintaineth (c) that *a lawfull Synod or Church by their sentence and authority may and ought to depose Ministers that are Idolatrous, Heretical and the like.* An expresse testimony, that Synods have not onely right of counsell and admonition, but also of exercising Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in the censuring of offenders. He addeth there, that *the Westerne Churches ought to remove such Clerkes or keep them out from entring, either by a common, or each of them by their particular judgement, either in a Synod or without a Synod.* VI. Even in this very page & place that Mr D. alledgeth, (d) *D. Voetius* alledging the example of the Synod at Ierusalem, *Act. 15.3.4.22.23.* to shew that *Ecclesiasticall power is given to many in the Church*, doth thereby acknowledge the authority of Synods. If he had thought they might onely counsell and admonish, then had this place alledged bene insufficient to prove the thing propounded by him, nor suitable to the other places alledged together in the same place, viz. *Matt. 18.17. 2. Cor. 2.6. with 1. Cor. 5.4.* which are to be understood of the jurisdiction and authority of the Church in censuring. This power is also againe (e) poynted at by him in the same chapter.

Lastly, to come from his words unto his practise; Whereas this learned Minister of Christ was deputed and sent (f) with others unto the last famous Nationall Synod at Dort, & was reckoned among those Worthies whose praise is so great in the Gospell, being the messengers of the Churches and the glory of Christ; when as he there among the rest did exercise the authority of suffrage for the decision of divers controversies, and gave sentence with others in the (g) censure and deposition of divers both Ministers and Elders, it appeareth hereby that he did not thinke all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction to be limited unto a particular Congregation. If Synods might goe no further then to counsell and admonish, then had D. Voetius with the rest bene an usurper of unlawfull power. Besides, this order of Classicall and Synodall assemblies, together with their jurisdiction and authority, in such sort as it was before, and is still practised in these Reformed Churches, was confirmed and established (h) in that same Nationall Synod, where *D. Voetius* appeared

(z) P. 79.
(a) P. 85.
(b) P. 169.
(c) P. 201.
(d) P. 186.
(e) P. 187. & 189.
(f) Act. Synod. Nat. Dordr. sess. 2.
(g) Ibid. sess. 138.
(h) Kercke-orden. Nat. Syn. Dordr. Art. 22-52.

as

as amember thereof, and according to which he was bound to practiſe both while he was Miniſter at *Heuſden*, and ſince alſo at *Vtrecht*, being not onely Profeſſour in the Univerſity, but alſo Paſtour of the Church in the ſayd city. So that there is no cauſe to doubt but that his judgement touching this controverſy is the ſame with that which I have here noted out of his writings, and for the ſubſtance of the matter, no other then that which I maintaine throughout this diſcourſe.

SECT. VIII. *Touching the Engliſh Church at Franckford in Q. Maries time.*

IO. DAV. (i) *And to conclude, thus it was ordered in the Engliſh Church at Franckford, among the exiles in thoſe Marian dayes, that if all the Miniſters and Seniors be ſuſpected, or found parties; if any appeale be made from them, that then ſuch appeale be made to the body of the Congregation, &c. and that the body of the Congregation may appoint ſo many of the Congregation to heare and determine the ſaid matter, or matters, as it ſhall ſeeme good to the Congregation.* Againe, *If any controverſy be about the doubtfull meaning of any word or words in the Diſcipline, that firſt it be referred to the Miniſters, or Seniors: and if they cannot agree thereupon, then the thing be referred to the whole Congregation.*

(i) Apol. reply. p. 143. A diſcourſe of the troubles in the Engl. Chur. at Franckf. Art. 62. Art. 67.

ANSVV. I. It is to be obſerved, that theſe two Articles of Diſcipline being alledged againſt me by (k) Mr Canne as well as by Mr Dav. there is this difference betwixt them, that Mr Canne addes more words then he ſhould, and Mr Daven. omits ſome words that ſhould have been added. That which Mr Canne addes, is againſt himſelfe, and ſerves to condemne the practiſe of the Browniſts, when he ſaith of the Miniſters and Seniors, that they *have authority to heare & determine, &c.* That which Mr Dav. omits, and refuſeth to expreſſe, ſerveth to reproove ſuch as complaine unjuſtly of excepting againſt the Elders judgement. For when that 62d Article ſpeakes of appeale to be made unto the body of the Congregation, *the Miniſters, Seniors, & parties excepted*; this latter clauſe ſhewes there is juſt cauſe of excepting againſt the Elders judgement ſometimes; and that they are to be refuſed as incompetent judges, being parties. This brief clauſe being of ſpeciall uſe in our controverſy, ought not to have bene omitted by Mr Dav.

(k) Churches plea, p. 36.

II. That which they alledge for appeale unto the body of the Congregation, doth not overthrow the authority of Synods. This granting one kinde of appeale doth not exclude or deny another. Seeing particular Congregations are ſubject to errour, and many of them dayly doe erre, why ſhould not appeale be granted from them unto Claſſes and Synods, eſpecially where there is no Magiſtrate that can or will judge of ſuch errours?

III. This appeale made unto the body of the Congregation was not uſually permitted, but extraordinarily in caſes of ſpeciall neceſſity, when the Miniſters and Seniors were not able to end the controverſies brought unto them: the expreſſe words of the Article are (l) *in caſe they cannot end them, then afterwards to be referred to the whole Congregation.* Their ordinary practiſe was otherwiſe, as appeares in other Articles of their Diſcipline, where it is plainly ordained, (m) *that the Miniſters and Seniors ſhall have authority to heare and determine, on the behalf of the whole Church all offences (determinable by the Congregation) committed by any perſon in the Congregation: unleſſe the partie called before them have juſt occaſion to take exception to the ſayd Miniſters and Seniors; or to appeale from them as not competent judges.* And afterwards

(l) Diſc. of troubl in Engl Ch. at Franckf. art. 57.
(m) Ibid. art. 59.

againe

(n) Art. 63. againe there is another ſtrict and ſevere decree (n) *If any perſon doe unjuſtly take exceptions to any of the Miniſters, or appeale from the whole miniſtery: that then ſuch perſons, beſide the puniſhment for the principall cauſe ſhall alſo be puniſhed as a contemner of the Miniſtery and a diſturber of the Church.* This order, as it ſerves to condemne the practiſe of the Browniſts, as tending to the diſturbance of the Church, while they give no power of judging and deciding cauſes unto the Elderſhip; ſo it ſerves for the reproofe both of them and Mr Davenp. in denying the authority of Synods: for if the Church may in ordinary caſes commit their authority unto an Elderſhip, & not deprive themſelves of their right, then why may they not doe ſo likewiſe unto Claſſes and Synods?

IIII. This Engliſh Church at Franckford did commit and delegate the power of judging controverſies, not onely to their Elders, but upon occaſion even unto other particular and private members of the Church, which had no Eccleſiaſticall office; and this in divers degrees, as 1. In caſe ſome of the Elderſhip, though the leſſer part, were excepted againſt as parties: 2. When the greater part were excepted againſt: 3. When all the Miniſters and Seniors were ſuſpected, &c. Thus they did erect as it were three ſeverall ſorts of Claſſes or Synods within themſelves for the judicature of ſuch cauſes as could not be ended by the Elderſhip. Thus they ordained in theſe three ſeverall Articles of their Diſcipline, which follow.

(o) Art. 60. „ *Of the firſt ſort:* (o) Item, if any have juſt occaſion to take exception to ſome „ of the Miniſters and Seniors, and not to the more part: that then thoſe of the „ Miniſters and Seniors to whom the exception is made, in this caſe ſhall not be „ judges, but in this caſe for the time removed from the miniſtery, and that the „ reſt of the Miniſters and Seniors to whom no exception ſhall be made, with as „ many of the Congregation joyned to them, as they be in number which ſhall „ be excepted, ſhall be arbiters and judges in the ſayd cauſes: and that the ſayd „ perſons ſo to be joyned to the Miniſters and Seniors, ſhall be appoynted by the „ Congregation, the Miniſters and Seniors not excepted, giving their voyces as „ others of the Congregation.

(p) Art. 61. „ *Of the ſecond ſort:* (p) Item, if exception be taken to the more part of the Mi„ niſters and Seniors, that then the Church ſhall appoynt ſix moe to be judges „ with the reſt of the Miniſters, againſt whom exception is not made: the ſame reſt „ of the Miniſters having their voyces in the election of the ſix, as other members „ of the Church.

(q) Art. 62. „ *Of the third ſort:* (q) Item, if all the Miniſters and Seniors be ſuſpected or found „ parties, or if any appeale be made from them, that then ſuch appeale be made „ to the body of the Congregation, the Miniſters, Seniors and parties excepted. „ And that the body of the Congregation may appoint ſo many of the Congrega„ tion to heare and determine the ſayd matter or matters, as it ſhall ſeeme good to „ the Congregation.

Now as in all theſe Cõmiſſions the Church did not looſe her authority, but did rather exerciſe the ſame herein; this very act of delegation being a teſtimony of her power: ſo in like manner (if the example of this Church alledged againſt me may

may be followed of us) other Churches may alſo ſend their Deputies and Delegates unto Claſſes & Synods, for the judgement & deciſion of ſuch cauſes as cannot be ſo well ended among themſelves.

V. Leſt any ſhould object that in all theſe Deputations, the judgement of controverſies was referred unto ſuch Officers or members of the Church as were within the ſame Congregation, and that they did not ſubmit their cauſes to the determination of any other judges out of themſelves; it is therefore further to be obſerved that there was an order agreed upon by the Engliſh Church at Franckford, that in the time of their contention (r) *the matter ſhould be determined by theſe five notable learned men*, which were of other Churches, *to wete, Calvin, Muſculus, Martyr, Bullinger & Viret. This agreement was put in writing. To that all gave their conſents. This day was joyfull. Thankes were given to God, brotherly reconciliation followed, &c. Yea the holy communion was upon this happy agreement alſo miniſtred.* This agreement is often repeated, & layd downe as a ground of comfort, & as a proof of their equity that did moſt conſtantly cleave thereunto. (r) Ibid. P. 37.38.& 41.48.

Afterwards againe, when more contention was rayſed in that Church, both the oppoſite parties were content not onely to heare the counſell & adviſe of men in other Churches, but to ſubmit unto their judgement, as farre as men may ſubmit unto the ſentence of any particular Church whatſoever. And for evidence hereof it is recorded how the one part of the Church declared their minde by this (ſ) writing following: (ſ) P. 100, 101.

„ We offer & permit with moſt willing mindes (having the licence of the Ma-
„ giſtrate as it may well be for this purpoſe) that all our controverſies and conten-
„ tions whatſoever, which have bene ſowne and brought in among us ſithence the
„ beginning of this breach, and ſince the firſt day we began to ſtrive, untill this
„ preſent time and houre: to be debated, decided and determined by Arbiters,
„ being none of this our Congregation, and yet from among the brethren, our
„ countrie men, equally and indifferently, by the parties diſagreeing, to be cho-
„ ſen upon this condition, that not onely the election of Miniſters and beſides all
„ other things done by the order of the ſayd diſcipline, ſtand in ſuſpence, to be al-
„ lowed or diſallowed by the determination and judgement of the Arbiters to be
„ choſen as is aforeſaid. written the 5. of April, Anno 1557.

The other part of the Church did in like manner witneſſe their conſent, by their writing, the copie whereof was as followeth:

„ We ſubmit ourſelves and are contented to commit all manner of controver-
„ ſies that have heretofore riſen amongſt us in the Church, to ſuch Arbiters as the
„ Magiſtrate hath appointed, and to all ſuch as they call unto them to the hea-
„ ring and determining thereof, according to Gods word and good reaſon. And
„ thus ſimply and plainly without any manner of exception or condition. In wit-
„ nes whereof we have ſubſcribed our names the 5. of April, Anno 1557.

Though there were ſome differences betwixt theſe parties in other particulars, yet they all agreed in this, to commit authority & power unto ſome out of themſelves, whom they would ſet up as Judges over them. Hereby it doth appeare that they did not confine and reſtraine the judgement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes

within the limits of one particular Congregation onely. And if a particular Church might thus referre their controverſies to the judgement of foure or five perſons out of themſelves, then might they as well or better be referred to the judgement of many Churches united together in Claſſes and Synods.

VI. This Engliſh Church which ſojourned at *Franckford*, for foure or five yeares in *Q. Maries* time, was not a ſetled and eſtabliſhed Church: they wanted the opportunity of combining themſelves with other Engliſh Churches. It was the miſery of this Church, that they wanted the help of ordinary Claſſes and Synods: and it is unreaſonable to make the ſpeciall defect or want of ſome one Church, a precedent for other Churches, to deprive them of that mutuall help which they may conveniently enjoy, and which God offers unto them. This Engliſh Church (t) was exerciſed with great troubles and continuall diſſentions all the time of their abode at Franckford, to the great grief and offence of many. The forme of their Diſcipline, and theſe Articles here objected by Mr Dav. and Mr Gan. were not fully agreed upon: the Paſtour and the Elders with ſome of the Church diſſented from the greater part of the Congregation. And in ſuch caſe, as Mr Fenner, before mentioned, doth teſtify, (v) the controverſy ought to have bene brought to a greater Senate, to a Claſſis or Synod, which he calles a Preſbytery of more Churches, for the deciding thereof. The want of this was the cauſe of their woe.

(t) Diſc. of troubl. in Engl. Ch. at Franckf. p. 27, &c. p. 62, &c. p. 135, &c.

(v) S. Theol. l. 7. c. 7. p. 278, &c.

VII. The Engliſh Church at Franckford in the want of a Claſſis might ſo much the rather allow appeales unto the Congregation, becauſe there were in that Church many learned men, able to diſcerne and judge of cauſes. In that Church (x) *they ſet up an Vniverſity*, and choſe ſeverall men for the reading of Hebrew, Greek, and Divinity lectures. The learned men that repaired unto this Church were alſo as famous for their piety and ſincerity, enduring perſecution for the Goſpell of Chriſt, chooſing rather to live in baniſhment with their afflicted brethren, then to enjoy the pleaſures and promotions of Antichriſt, which they might have had in their owne countrie, if they would have bowed their necks to his yoke. In ſuch a Church it was more tolerable to appeale unto the body of the Congregation, then in many other that are farre unlike. And yet if ſuch a Church, abounding with ſo many Worthies, could not well ſubſiſt alone, in their want of a Claſſicall government, but fell into ſo great contentions and ſcandals; this may juſtly ſerve for the warning of other Churches, and teach them to ſeek the help of neighbour-churches, & to ſubmit themſelves mutually unto ſuch combinations, as the Lord ſhall give opportunity.

(x) Diſc. &c p. 60.

Laſtly, when as afterwards it pleaſed God to viſit his people, and to reſtore the light of the Goſpel and true Religion unto England by that gracious and noble inſtrument of his goodnes, *Qu. Elizabeth*, of ever bleſſed memory, then theſe excellent and eminent lights of his Church returning againe into their country, did give a plaine teſtimony unto this trueth, that all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is not limited unto a particular Congregation. Some of them being promoted unto chief places of government in England, did by their practiſe profeſſe that particular Churches may ſubmit themſelves unto a ſuperiour authority out of their owne Con-

Congregation. Some of them became Miniſters of the Church of Scotland, & ſtood for the maintenance of that Diſcipline, which from the beginning of the Reformation, acknowledged the authority and juriſdiction of Synods. None of them (for ought I ever heard) that dreamed of the ſingle uncompounded policie. Though there were ſome differences among them concerning the government of the Church; yet no one of them or of thoſe other exiles who had ſojourned at *Straſbrough, Baſel, Zurick, Arrow, Genèva* and other places, in Q. Maries dayes, that left behinde them any monument of their agreement with Mr Dav. & Mr Cann. in limiting Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction unto a particular Church. But of this ſtory, we have occaſion to ſpeak further hereafter, (y) where Mr Can. againe brings more objections from thence. (y) Chap. 7. Sect. 5.

SECT. IX. *Mr Dav. his pretence of agreement with Iunius examined.*

BEſides the former Allegations, Mr Dav. pretendeth his agreement with *Iunius* in this queſtion: And after his vaine excuſe of *H. Grotius* for ſlighting the authority of Claſſes and Synods, as he did in that treatiſe which he publiſhed againſt *Sibr. Lubbertus*, he ſayth, (z) thereupon *Bogermannus publiſhed his Annotations learnedly and ſuccinctly penned, in defence of D. Sibrandus, wherein, for anſwer of that part which concerned the neceſſity and authority of Synods, he referred Grotius to what Iunius had written againſt Bellarmine* de nceeſſitate & poteſtate Conciliorum, *wherein I fully agree with Iunius.* ANSVV. Had Mr Dav. *fully agreed* with Junius, then had it bene meet that the ſhould have brought at leaſt ſome one pregnant teſtimony out of Junius, to have manifeſted their agreement, which he hath not done. If he will conſtantly and fully abide by this confeſſion of his *full agreement* with Junius in that which he wrote againſt Bellarmine concerning the neceſſity and authority of Synods, then muſt he acknowledge that they have juriſdiction over particular Churches for the judging of their cauſes, and that they are not onely for counſell and admonition, &c. becauſe (a) Junius is plentifull in witneſſing thus much of them: as appeareth, (z) Apol. reply. p. 225. (a) Animadv. ad Bellarm. Contr. 4. de Concil.

Firſt, Bellarmine complayning how the Proteſtants by the inſtigation of Satan, did *deſtroy Eccleſiaſticall judgements*: Junius anſwereth, (b) *We alſo complaine of the deceytfull arts of Satan: but they are not to be deemed to take away Eccleſiaſticall judgements, which with Paul, 1. Cor. 14. doe urge that* the ſpirits of the Prophets be ſubject to the Prophets: *but that do we urge, &c.* Junius applying this to Synods, doth thereby confeſſe that they are for cenſure and judgement of cauſes and perſons, & not for counſell onely. He acknowledgeth the Proteſtants juſtly deſired ſuch a Councell, (c) *in quo cognoſci, decerni & confici omnia poſſe confiderent*, that is, *wherein they hoped that all things might be examined, decreed and diſpatched.* This was more then counſelling, and implyed juriſdiction and power of judgement. More plainely, he ſaith, we deſire a Councell, &c. (d) *after ſuch a manner as we ſee to have bene done of old, in the examples of Synods, eſpecially of the firſt Nicene, of the Chalcedon, &c.* Now it is manifeſt in the Hiſtories, that in theſe Synods there was not onely a giving of counſell, but an exerciſe of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction in the cenſure and condemnation of Hereticks: as is hereafter ſhewed at large. Againe, when Bellarmine accuſeth the Proteſtants, that *they deſire a Generall Councell, but ſuch a one as never was:* (b) In præfat. nota. 1. (c) Not. 11. (d) N. 13.

(e) N.38. *was*: Junius answereth, (e) *It is false.* But if we should desire such a Councell as Mr Dav. describes, such a one as should be for counsell and admonition, without jurisdiction; then should the Answer of Junius be false: we should desire such a Synod as never was. It cannot be shewed that ever such a Generall Councell was held. When Bellarmine accuseth Melanchon for requiring such conditions of a Synod, that neither the persons nor causes of men should be condemned, and that so nothing at all should be decreed in the Synod: Junius answereth that this is fayned or forged of him; and shewes further that though it doe not become the Church to use a bloody cure, and corporall punishments, yet there is a more

(f) N.40. wholesome order, and tells what that is, saying, (f) *What? Arius being overcome and convinced, how was he punished of the Synod? How was Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, in those renowned Synods? Silence was injoyned them, and their office taken away: nothing more.* A most expresse testimony of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction exercised in the deposing of evill Ministers. This was more then counsell onely.

After the Preface, when in the book itself Bellarmine complaines of Hereticks, that *they devise a new forme of Synods, and then give almost no authority unto them:*

(g) Anim-adv. in Cōtr. 4. de Cōcil. l. 1. c. 1. n. 1. Junius answereth, (g) *As for us, we deny both; and will (God willing) confute the first affirmation in the first book, and the latter in the second.* But Mr Dav. cannot justly deny eyther of those assertions: for first, the single uncompounded policie doth necessarily inferre a new forme of Synods: if it be not so, let him shew when and where such a forme was ever used of old. And for the second, it is granted by

(h) Apol. reply. p. 47. Mr D. his owne confession, when he alledgeth (h) that *other Churches have no power of hindring a faulty election, but by admonition, which power every Christian hath in another, for his good.* Is not this to give almost no power to Synods? Bellarmine to shew the divine originall of Synods alledgeth *Matt.* 18. *there am I in the midst of*

(i) In cap. 3. l. 1. de Conc. n. 1. *them.* Iunius assenting to him, sayth (i) *It is also demonstrated in these words of the Apostle Paul*, 1. *Cor.* 14. 32. *The spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets.* Both places import an authority whereunto subjection is required. When Bellarmine sayth of Bishops in Synods, that they are not Counsellours but Judges; Junius no-

(k) N. 2. teth (k) that *they are neither Counsellours nor Iudges, but declarers & ministers of the judgement of God in the holy Scripture*: in which words he ascribeth as much power and jurisdiction unto Synods as he doth unto particular Churches. His meaning for both (according to his use of speech) is that they are not absolute but ministeriall judges.

Whereas Bellarmine reckoneth up sundry sorts of persons that may be present at Synods, some as judges, which have a deciding or determining voyce; some for disputation, which have a consulting voyce; some as servitours or attendants; some for the defence of the Synod, to maintaine peace, &c. Junius denyeth not

(l) Ibid. in c. 15. n. 2. this but shewes that his enumeration is insufficient, saying, (l) *It is to be added, others as parties or persons accused, whose cause is to be handled: for certainly it is inhumane that any should be condemned not cited, or not heard: Others againe to be Auditours, seeking their edification by enjoying that communication of holy things.* Hereby it is plaine that he acknowledged the jurisdiction of Synods, and that they were not onely for counsell; both because he allowes a distinction of them in the Synod which had

the

the authority of a determining voyce, from them that did onely diſpute or conſult; and becauſe he intimates a judiciall proceeding in the Synods, by mentioning parties accuſed, their citing or calling of them, & the condemning of them, which imports a further matter then onely of admonition or counſell. Whereas Bellarmine accuſeth us that we allow any learned men, though Laicks, to have a determining voyce, let their office be what it will: Junius anſwereth, (m) *Theſe things have none of us ſayd or thought, as they are here layd downe. This is that which we ſay; ſuch are to be taken into the Synod which are furniſhed with gifts and calling; which for gifts are godly, honeſt, learned; for their calling, which are either ordinarily appointed to teach, or extraordinarily ſent for and brought by juſt authority.* Now this neceſſity of a calling which he ſo (n) often urgeth and requireth to be in the members of a Synod, doth argue a ſpeciall power and authority belonging unto them, by vertue whereof they may give ſentence in the judgement of cauſes; whereas to admoniſh or counſell requires no more power then that which every Chriſtian hath in another, for his good, as Mr D. himſelf confeſſeth. To the ſame purpoſe Junius ſhewes againſt Bellarmine, that the meaning of Theodoſius and Valentinian was not to admit Biſhops onely, but that (o) *thoſe onely might heare, examine, and give ſentence in a Synod, which being ſent from the Churches unto the Synod, were reckoned up of the Biſhops, according to their letters of publick authority which they were wont to exhibit.* Againe he ſayth, (p) *They which are preſent without the authority of the Church, of them ſome may onely heare, as the laicks* or common people; *ſome may be uſed in conſultations, as the learned men, eſpecially Eccleſiaſticall perſons; but they may not give definitive ſentence.* And thus ſtill by diſtinguiſhing thoſe that gave counſell, from thoſe that gave ſentence in the Synod, it appeares he acknowledged a power of juriſdiction in Synods, and that they were not onely for counſell. So when Bellarmine ſayth it was a fault in the Councell of Baſill, that Preſbyters or other learned men beſides Biſhops, were allowed to have not onely a conſulting voyce, but a deciding ſuffrage, & affirmeth that this was againſt the cuſtome of all antiquity, &c. Junius anſwereth, (q) *This we denye: for it was the firſt inſtitution, Act. 15. and not onely the manner and cuſtome. Seeing therefore there was ſuch an inſtitution of the Apoſtles, & in their aſſembly, what need was there to alledge cuſtome? &c.*

(m) N. 4.

(n) See c. 16. n. 10. & 18. & 20. & c. 17. n. 1.

(o) Ibid. c. 15. n. 13.

(p) N. 15.

(q) N. 19.

When Bellarmine chargeth the Proteſtants as holding that a Synod is nothing but an inquiſition; and that Chriſt alone and his written word hath a determining voyce: Junius ſayth, (r) *It is falſe. for Synods have both an inquiſition of that which is true, juſt, holy by religious communication, and alſo a miniſteriall giving of ſentence.* Though he ſhew there and in many annotations following, that it is not lawfull for Chriſtians to obey them further then they agree with the Scriptures; that their ſentence of it ſelf is but a perſuaſion, and not a conſtraint; a miniſteriall judgement, not of abſolute authority of it ſelf, &c. yet he (ſ) grants the Lord hath commanded that we ſhould obey the ſentence of a lawfull Synod, aſſembled together in his name, &c. He ſayth, (t) *Synods have true judgements, ſo farre as they are of God according to the tables of his trueth and commandement: of themſelves they are not judgements, but declarations, publications, and miniſteriall pronouncings of the trueth and judgements of God.* And more then this cannot be yeelded to any Eccleſiaſticall ju-

(r) Ibid. in c. 18. n. 1.

(ſ) N. 8.

(t) N. 14.

(e) N.38. *was*: Junius answereth, (e) *It is false.* But if we should desire such a Councell as Mr Dav. describes, such a one as should be for counsell and admonition, without jurisdiction; then should the Answer of Junius be false: we should desire such a Synod as never was. It cannot be shewed that ever such a Generall Councell was held. When Bellarmine accuseth Melancthon for requiring such conditions of a Synod, that neither the persons nor causes of men should be condemned, and that so nothing at all should be decreed in the Synod: Junius answereth that this is fayned or forged of him; and shewes further that though it doe not become the Church to use a bloody cure, and corporall punishments, yet there is a more

(f) N.40. wholesome order, and tells what that is, saying, (f) *What? Arius being overcome and convinced, how was he punished of the Synod? How was Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, in those renowned Synods? Silence was injoyned them, and their office taken away: nothing more.* A most expresse testimony of Eccleiasticall jurisdiction exercised in the deposing of evill Ministers. This was more then counsell onely.

After the Preface, when in the book it self Bellarmine complaines of Hereticks, that *they devise a new forme of Synods, and then give almost no authority unto them:*

(g) Animadv. in Cõtr. 4. de Cõcil. l. 1. c. 1. n. 1. Junius answereth, (g) *As for us, we deny both; and will (God willing) confute the first affirmation in the first book, and the latter in the second.* But Mr Dav. cannot justly deny eyther of those assertions: for first, the single uncompounded policie doth necessarily inferre a new forme of Synods: if it be not so, let him shew when and where such a forme was ever used of old. And for the second, it is granted by

(h) Apol. reply. p. 47. Mr D. his owne confession, when he alledgeth (h) that *other Churches have no power of hindring a faulty election, but by admonition, which power every Christian hath in another, for his good.* Is not this to give almost no power to Synods? Bellarmine to shew the divine originall of Synods alledgeth *Matt.* 18. *there am I in the midst of*

(i) In cap. 3. l. 1. de Conc. n. 1. *them.* Iunius assenting to him, sayth (i) *It is also demonstrated in these words of the Apostle Paul, 1. Cor. 14. 32. The spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets.* Both places import an authority whereunto subjection is required. When Bellarmine sayth of Bishops in Synods, that they are not Counsellours but Judges; Junius noteth

(k) N. 2. (k) that *they are neither Counsellours nor Iudges, but declarers & ministers of the judgement of God in the holy Scripture:* in which words he ascribeth as much power and jurisdiction unto Synods as he doth unto particular Churches. His meaning for both (according to his use of speech) is that they are not absolute but ministeriall judges.

Whereas Bellarmine reckoneth up sundry sorts of persons that may be present at Synods, some as judges, which have a deciding or determining voyce; some for disputation, which have a consulting voyce; some as servitours or attendants; some for the defence of the Synod, to maintaine peace, &c. Junius denyeth not

(l) Ibid. in c. 15. n. 2. this but shewes that his enumeration is insufficient, saying, (l) *It is to be added, others as parties or persons accused, whose cause is to be handled: for certainly it is inhumane that any should be condemned not cited, or not heard: Others againe to be Auditours, seeking their edification by enjoying that communication of holy things.* Hereby it is plaine that he acknowledged the jurisdiction of Synods, and that they were not onely for counsell; both because he allowes a distinction of them in the Synod which had

the

the authority of a determining voyce, from them that did onely diſpute or conſult; and becauſe he intimates a judiciall proceeding in the Synods, by mentioning parties accuſed, their citing or calling of them, & the condemning of them, which imports a further matter then onely of admonition or counſell. Whereas Bellarmine accuſeth us that we allow any learned men, though Laicks, to have a determining voyce, let their office be what it will: Junius anſwereth, (m) *Theſe things have none of us ſayd or thought, as they are here layd downe. This is that which we ſay; ſuch are to be taken into the Synod which are furniſhed with gifts and calling; which for gifts are godly, honeſt, learned; for their calling, which are either ordinarily appointed to teach, or extraordinarily ſent for and brought by juſt authority.* Now this neceſſity of a calling which he ſo (n) often urgeth and requireth to be in the members of a Synod, doth argue a ſpeciall power and authority belonging unto them, by vertue whereof they may give ſentence in the judgement of cauſes; whereas to admoniſh or counſell requires no more power then that which every Chriſtian hath in another, for his good, as Mr D. himſelf confeſſeth. To the ſame purpoſe Junius ſhewes againſt Bellarmine, that the meaning of Theodoſius and Valentinian was not to admit Biſhops onely, but that (o) *thoſe onely might heare, examine, and give ſentence in a Synod, which being ſent from the Churches unto the Synod, were reckoned up of the Biſhops, according to their letters of publick authority which they were wont to exhibit.* Againe he ſayth, (p) *They which are preſent without the authority of the Church, of them ſome may onely heare, as the laicks* or common people; *ſome may be uſed in conſultations, as the learned men, eſpecially Eccleſiaſticall perſons; but they may not give definitive ſentence.* And thus ſtill by diſtinguiſhing thoſe that gave counſell, from thoſe that gave ſentence in the Synod, it appeares he acknowledged a power of juriſdiction in Synods, and that they were not onely for counſell. So when Bellarmine ſayth it was a fault in the Councell of Baſill, that Preſbyters or other learned men beſides Biſhops, were allowed to have not onely a conſulting voyce, but a deciding ſuffrage, & affirmeth that this was againſt the cuſtome of all antiquity, &c. Junius anſwereth, (q) *This we denye: for it was the firſt inſtitution, Act. 15. and not onely the manner and cuſtome. Seeing therefore there was ſuch an inſtitution of the Apoſtles, & in their aſſembly, what need was there to alledge cuſtome? &c.*

(m) N. 4.

(n) See c. 16. n. 10. & 18. & 20. & c. 17. n. 1.

(o) Ibid. c. 15. n. 13.

(p) N. 15.

(q) N. 19.

When Bellarmine chargeth the Proteſtants as holding that a Synod is nothing but an inquiſition; and that Chriſt alone and his written word hath a determining voyce: Junius ſayth, (r) *It is falſe. for Synods have both an inquiſition of that which is true, juſt, holy by religious communication, and alſo a miniſteriall giving of ſentence.* Though he ſhew there and in many annotations following, that it is not lawfull for Chriſtians to obey them further then they agree with the Scriptures; that their ſentence of it ſelf is but a perſuaſion, and not a conſtraint; a miniſteriall judgement, not of abſolute authority of itſelf, &c. yet he (ſ) grants the Lord hath commanded that we ſhould obey the ſentence of a lawfull Synod, aſſembled together in his name, &c. He ſayth, (t) *Synods have true judgements, ſo farre as they are of God according to the tables of his trueth and commandement: of themſelves they are not judgements, but declarations, publications, and miniſteriall pronouncings of the trueth and judgements of God.* And more then this cannot be yeelded to any Eccleſiaſticall ju-

(r) Ibid. in c. 18. n. 3.

(ſ) N. 8.

(t) N. 14.

judicatory whatsoever. Herein he fully grants as much jurisdiction to Synods, as belongs to any particular Congregation or Eldership, either apart or joyntly together.

When Bellarmine blames the Protestants for their exception againſt the Councell of Trent, Junius answereth, (v) *It is the ordinary way of right in every appeale*, that the judgement of Synods, and the exequution of their sentence be suspended and stayed so long untill the matter be againe examined in another more free or greater Assembly, &c. This answer had bene needles and impertinent, unlesse Synods had more power then of counsell and admonition onely. He sayth, (x) *Certainly in every just Synod, Hereticks being cited, heard, present, or willfully hiding themselves, have bene condemned: &c.* When Bellarm. objects that Protestants will have nothing to be determined in Synods, and so strifes to be never ended; Junius answers, (y) that he perverts their meaning, and referres us to his preface, *nota* 40. where the Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction of Synods is plainely avouched.

(v) Ibid. in c. 21. n. 1.

(x) N. 7.

(y) N. 23.

IUnius proceeding to the examination of his second book touching Synods, where Bellarmine repeats, that *Synods of Bishops may judge all controversies both of faith and manners*, Junius answereth, (z) *We have granted it of those that are lawfull Synods.* When Bellarmine had sayd that *nothing is greater then a lawfull and approved Generall Councell*; Junius answereth, (a) *It is false: for Christ is greater, and the Scripture is greater: seeing Christ and the Scripture are great of themselves: the Church is great by them, &c.* But this answer had bene insufficient & not direct enough, if my opposites opinion were true. For then according to their opinion, he might more fitly have answered: that the authority of a particular Congregation is greater then the authority of a Generall Synod; becaus though the counsell and advise of the Synod was more to be reverenced in respect of many excellently learned and godly men from many Churches that were in it; yet seeing Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction is limited to a particular Congregation, therefore the same is greater in the power of censuring, and in the use of the keyes for binding and loosing of impenitent sinners; seeing Synods have no jurisdiction at all over any other Churches.

(z) Anim. adv. in Bell. l. 2. de Cõcil. c. 1. n. 1.

(a) Ibid. c. 4. n. 2.

Againe, when Bellarmine sets downe this insolent proposition, that the Pope cannot commit, neither unto a Synod, nor to any man the coactive judgement over himself, but onely the discretive: Iunius answereth, (b) *The proposition is most true, he cannot commit: becaus God hath committed it to the Synod and lawfull Councell. Wherefore we say on the contrary, neither can he commit it (for if he be the servant of God, God hath committed the judgement concerning him unto his Church) neither can he reject it: but though he be unwilling, yet both the Church is bound to judge concerning him, and he to undergoe the judgement thereof, discretive and coactive, howsoever it please men to call it.* If Mr Dav. doe fully agree with Junius, as he professeth, then must he acknowledge that Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction is not limited to a particular Church; that lawfull Synods have authority not onely to counsell and admonish the Pope himself, and so other obstinate offendours, but also to censure thē, & to give sentence both of directive & coactive judgement against them, as occasion requires. Junius to make this more plaine, repeats it againe, and speaking of the Synods judging the Pope, saith, (c) *Truely we grant that he cannot appoynt judges in his owne cause, becaus God hath al-*

(b) Ibid. in c. 18. n. 1.

(c) N. 2.

already appoynted them by the Apoſtle, ſaying, The ſpirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets, 1. Cor. 14. 32. *and that he may appoynt Arbiters: but we adde this withall, that the judges which God hath ordained, may by no right be rejected or refuſed of him.*

When Bellarmine pretends that divers Popes, as Sixtus the 3d, Leo the 3d, Symmachus, and Leo the 4th being accuſed, were willing to have their cauſes diſcuſſed in a Synod of Biſhops, &c. Junius ſayth, (d) *And this ought ſo to be done of them: for they are ſubjected of God to a Synod of Prophets, by authority of the word.* When Bellar. addes that yet the Biſhops durſt not judge them, affirming alſo, that they left the whole judgement unto God: Junius anſwers, (e) *This is a fallacy from that which is not the cauſe, as they call it. For they did not therefore abſtaine from judging, becauſe they wanted authority to judge, but partly becauſe they had rather that the Popes being guilty ſhould be firſt judged of themſelves and their owne conſcience, partly becauſe they thought it better to have their cauſe examined in another more full Synod, partly alſo becauſe when they would examine it, the matter was not evident enough, &c.* Whereas the Popes that thus farre ſubmitted their cauſe to tryall, pretend that by this fact they doe not preſcribe a law to their ſucceſſours, whereby they ſhould be conſtrained to doe the ſame: Junius ſayth, (f) *The impudency of theſe men is ſo much the greater, who after they are delivered from judgement, doe after this manner mock their judges and ſuch as examined their cauſe, and will have their ambitious licentiouſnes to be eſteemed for a lawfull order, aſſcribing the lawfull order of judgements in their cauſe unto an extraordinary and voluntary diſpenſation, as they call it.* But had Junius bene of my oppoſites minde, he ſhould have anſwered after another manner, & ſhould have ſayd, The Biſhops in the Synods which durſt not judge the cauſe of the Popes, but left the whole judgement unto God did well therein if they had knowne what they did, and the right ground thereof; for they did indeed want authority to judge: Synods might adviſe and counſell, but have no juriſdiction to give ſentence in cenſuring either the Pope or any other: Synods may onely direct particular Churches to uſe their power aright, but have no power themſelves to judge other Congregations, or any member thereof, &c. How farre was Junius from giving ſuch an anſwer?

(d) N. 6.
(e) N. 7.
(f) Ibidē.

Other examples and inſtances alledged to ſhew the power of Synods in the judgement of cauſes, are avouched, cleared and maintained by Junius againſt Bellarmines exceptions, as appeares in the cauſe of (g) Marcellinus, of the (h) Donatiſts, and of (i) Leo. Had he thought that all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction had bene ſhut up within the bounds of a particular Congregation, he ought to have reprehended thoſe Synods, rather then to have ſpent time in vindicating their practiſe from the cavills of adverſaries.

(g) Ibid. in c. 19 n. 1.
(h) N. 3.
(i) N. 5.

AS in theſe books *de Conciliis*, alledged by Mr Dav. Junius hath plainely ſhewed his agreement with us: ſo in his diſputations againſt Bellarmine *de Verbo Dei*, he hath likewiſe declared his conſent with us touching the authority of Synods. He writes there, that (k) *there be two kindes of judgements in the Church: one Private, which belongs to all the faithfull, univerſally and ſeverally; the other Publick, depending upon a publick calling and authority: the law and rule of both theſe judgements is the holy Scripture; the authour and guide is the holy Ghoſt. The publick judgement is either of a particular Church, or of many Churches meeting together into one body, or of all; which body*

(k) Anim. adv. in Bell. contr. 1. de Verbo Dei l. 3. c. 3. n. 9.

they call a Synod, a Councell, or an Assembly, &c. Seeing the Præsident and judge of the private judgement (whereof the publick is compact) is the Spirit of God, and the Scripture the law, there can be no other judge or law appoynted in the publick judgement of Synods, without most hainous blasphemy against God, and reproach to his Church. And the Præsidents which are given to Synods, have not the dominion and arbritement of the busines, but the procuring of order committed unto them, to determine matters by that one judge according to his law. It is here to be obſerved that under the publick judgement of the Church, he doth in like manner comprehend the authority of particular Churches, and of Synods conſiſting of many Churches: he ſpeakes no otherwiſe of one then of the other, as touching the kinde of power that they have: he doth not attribute juriſdiction to one & counſell to the other: he notes both to depend upon a publick calling and authority, for a ground of their proceeding. And though in both the Spirit of God be the principall judge; yet (as he) (l) afterwards notes more plainly) he acknowledgeth a miniſteriall judgment committed to them, for the denouncing of his judgement againſt ſuch as are guilty according to his word.

(l) Ibid. in c.5.n.3.5.28.

(m) Ibid. in c.6.n.3.

Afterward, Junius (m) ſhewing how unlike the Councell of Trent was to the Nicene Councell, where the Arian Biſhops being preſent were heard, convicted by the authority of Gods word, and being convicted were condemned: though he avoucheth the Biſhops of Trent to have bene the enemies of the Goſpel, yet he ſayth, (n) *Otherwiſe as for lawfull Biſhops or Elders and Deacons lawfully called into a Synod, & holding the ſame lawfully, we acknowledge all theſe things.*

(n) N.4.

When Bellarmine alledgeth Baſilius the Emperour, who ſpeaking of the judg-
„ ment of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes in a Synod, ſayd, To try and ſearch out theſe
„ things, it belongeth unto Patriarkes, Biſhops, and Prieſts who have an office
„ of government alotted unto them, who have the power of ſanctifying, of loo-
„ ſing and binding, who have obtained the keyes of the Church, and not unto
„ us which are to be fed, which ſtand in need to be ſanctifyed, to be bound or looſed from binding: Junius anſwereth, (o) *We allow this teſtimony of Baſilius touching the lawfull order of Synods, as before.* Herein we have the expreſſe confeſſion of Junius touching the authority and juriſdiction of Synods, in the uſe of the keyes, binding and looſing.

(o) Ibid. in c.7.n.9.

When Bellarmine ſends us unto Damaſcene, who ſayth touching the contro-
„ verſies in the Church, To determine and decree of theſe things, it belongeth
„ not to Kings, but to Synods. For where two or three, ſaith the Lord, are ga-
„ thered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them. Chriſt hath not
„ given unto Kings the power of binding and looſing, but unto the Apoſtles and
„ their ſucceſſours, to Paſtours and Teachers. Junius anſwereth, (p) *Theſe things certainly are true, and nothing for that famous principality of the Romane Biſhop, &c. We alſo affirme the ſame thing, as before, cap.3. not a 9. & 10.* Another evident affirmation touching the juriſdiction and power of Synods.

(p) Ibid. in c.8.n.6.

When Bellarmine ſaith that *Proſper* doth *no otherwiſe* proove the Pelagians to be Hereticks, but becauſe they were condemned of the Romane Biſhops, *Innocentius, Zozimus, Bonifacius & Celeſtine:* Junius anſwereth, (q) *No otherwiſe? It is falſe. for Pelagius was firſt condemned by the Synod of Carthage and of Milevis: but when he went*

(q) N.14.

went beyond ſea to Rome, where he ſo craftily inſinuated himſelf, that there was great feare leſt he ſhould inflict a ſoarer wound upon the Church at Rome; the Africane Biſhops did prudently and religiouſly certify Innocentius by two letters, both concerning the ſentence of their Synods, and concerning the imminent perill of the Romane Church, unleſſe according to the example of them in Africa they did provide for the publick ſafety, &c. Another example of Synodicall juriſdiction allowed by Junius.

AGaine, in his diſputations againſt Bellarmine *de Pontifice Romano*, Junius doth often allow the authority and juriſdiction of Synods, and ſhewes his judgement, that Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is not limited to a particular Congregation. When Bellarmine ſpeaking of a certaine decree made in a Synod of Africa, mentioned by Cyprian, ſayth, it was ordained thereby, *that a cauſe ſhould firſt be judged, where the crime was committed, that it did not forbid but that it might be judged againe in another place*: Junius anſwereth, (r) *Certainly this is not forbidden: For it is of common right.* But that which is of common equity in caſe of appeale, to have a cauſe judged againe by another judicatory, is denyed by my oppoſites, in allowing no ſuch Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction. Whereas Bellarmine condemneth the Magdeburgenſes, as being altogether abſurd and ridiculous for their denyall of appeales; Junius denyes the fact; and ſaith (f) his reaſoning is inconſequent: that all appeales ſhould be altogether forbidden, becauſe the appeales to them beyond the ſea were forbidden.

(r) Anim. adv. in Bell. contr. 3. de Pont. Rom. l. 2. c. 23. n. 3

(f) N. 5.

When Calvine alledgeth a certaine Canon of the Synod held at Milevis in Africa, to refute the ambitious uſurpation of the Pope, and manifeſts thereby the juriſdiction of Synods in the judgement of cauſes, becauſe it was decreed that appeales ſhould be made to the Africane Synods, and not to the Biſhop of Rome: Junius (t) maintaines this allegation and vindicates it againſt the exceptions of Bellarmine. And he (v) alledgeth further to this purpoſe the epiſtle which the Councell of Africa wrote unto Pope Celeſtine in theſe words: *After due ſalutation officiouſly premiſed, we earneſtly deſire that hereafter you would not admit unto your audience thoſe that come from hence, and that you would not receive into your communion thoſe that are excommunicated of us, &c.* This requeſt Junius calles *a modeſt and brotherly prohibition*, to wit, that the Pope ſhould not receive appeales from them: But if there were no ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall power to judge the controverſies of a particular Congregation, then might theſe Africane Synods have bene accuſed of uſurpation over particular Churches, as tranſgreſſing the bounds of modeſty and of their calling, for exerciſing the power of the keyes in excommunicating ſome, as well as the Pope for his uſurped authority of the keyes in receiving appeales from the Synods. Then had both the allegation of Calvine and the defence of Junius, bene partiall and unjuſt, condemning that in the Pope which they allowed in Synods.

(t) Ibid. in c. 24. n 2. &c.

(v) N. 11.

When Bellarmine acknowledgeth that the Pope is bound to keep the Eccleſiaſticall lawes made by Synods, but *quoad directionem, non quoad coactionem*, according to the diſtinction of Lawyers touching the Prince; meaning that the Pope may uſe their direction, but is not under their correction or conſtraint; which is indeed the ſame thing in effect which my oppoſites affirme of particular Churches

ches, that they are bound to use the counsell and direction of Synods, but are not subject to their censure, nor under their jurisdiction? Junius (x) denyes this distinction. for though (saith he) we should grant that it take place *in foro soli*, in civill courts, to wit, for the judging of Princes; yet is it of no force in *foro cœli et conscientiæ*, in Ecclesiasticall judicatories, because the reason of them is not alike, &c. And in the next animadversion (y) speaking still of those lawes & canons made by Synods, he affirmeth, that as every other Bishop, so the Pope also is subject unto them, according to the order of the Church.

(x) Ibid. in c. 27. n. 6.

(y) N. 7.

When Bellarmine sayth, the Councell or Synod of the Greekes could not make a law for the Latines, &c. Junius (z) denyes the same, and gives a reason, *because that Synod was Oecumenicall*, or universall. Therein he acknowledgeth that they had a greater authority then onely to admonish or counsell. Againe, when Bellarmine answering the argument of Nilus saith that the Pope is not subject to Canõs, viz. of Synods, &c. that he is subject to Christ & not to the Fathers, that he doth not contemne the Fathers nor their Canons, but useth them for direction, though he cannot be compelled by them, &c. Junius (a) opposeth him further, & saith, (b) that *he ought to be subject both to Christ, and to the fathers by Christ, who hath so prescribed*, 1. Cor. 14. 29, 32. and addeth further, (c) *If he cannot be compelled by the Canons, that he is therefore rightly called by the Spirit of God ὁ ἄνομος*, that wicked one or lawlesse person, 2. *Thes.* 2. Whereas some now adayes beginne to speak evill of the jurisdiction of Classes and Synods, as of an Antichristian authority, Junius is so farre opposite unto them, that he accounts the Pope even in this regard to be Antichrist and the Man of Sinne, because he refuseth to be subject unto the authority of Synods in their canons and decrees.

(z) N. 16. See also n. 33.

(a) N. 40.

(b) N. 42.

(c) N. 46.

Moreover, in comparing of the Civill and Ecclesiasticall estate, Junius sayth, (d) *Kings have their authority in Civill matters, Rom.* 13. *and the Synod in Ecclesiasticall matters above the Pope, as it was defined in the Councell of Constance and Basel. And their authority is so certaine, as it is certaine that he which by force repelleth force, is armed with publick authority.* He distinguisheth their jurisdiction in respect of the causes judged by them, and repeats this their authority againe in the (e) next animadversion. And though these two kindes of government, Civill and Ecclesiasticall, doe use a different manner of compulsion, he sayth, (f) *Nihil refert: nos de rei substantia agimus: coactionem uterque habet; sed hic spiritualem, ille temporalem, &c. It skilleth not: we intreat of the substance of the matter: both of them have a coactive power*, or a compulsion: *but the one spirituall, the other temporall, &c.* A most evident assertion of Synodall jurisdiction, and that they are not to direct onely by way of counsell, but to correct also by way of censure.

(d) Ibid. in c. 29. n. 27.

(e) N. 28.

(f) N. 29.

To these I might adde many other testimonies of *Iunius*: but these evidences already cited may be sufficient to shew that he was not of this strange opinion, touching the independency of Churches; and that Mr Daven. therefore hath abused his Readers, and sought to blinde their eyes, when for the credit of his cause, he would have it thought that *Iunius* was of his minde, while he professeth that he doth *fully agree* with him.

SECT.

SECT. X. *His pretence of agreement with Dr Whitaker examined.*

MR Dav. to colour his opinion, as if it were no singular conceit of *Mr Iacob* and some few others, makes mention of the *Centuriatours*, as if they were of the same minde; yet he alledgeth not their words, to prove the same. But instead of others he chooseth out *Dr Whitaker*, as if he had bene a favourer of this opinion, which it is likely that he never heard of, and sayth, (g) *To these I may adde those who have handled the controversies concerning the necessity, and authority of Councills, amongst whom I will instance in Dr Whitaker, who speaking of the fullnes of that delegated power which Christ hath given to the Church, not to the Pope (which he applyeth to the Keyes in binding and loosing, shutting and opening, retaining and remitting sinnes) sayth, that this power belongeth primarily, principally, and essentially to the Church, but to the severall Bishops onely accidentally, secundarily, and lesse principally, and explaineth himself by a rule in Philosophy, which is, that when any power is in two, in one necessarily & essentially, in another contingently and accidentally, it is more principally in him, in whom it is necessarily and essentially, then in him, whose it is onely contingently and accidentally. As the heat is more principally in the fire then in the water, because it is in the water by reason of the fire. So (sayth he) seeing this jurisdiction and fullnes of power is given to the Church necessarily and primarily, but to the Pope onely secundarily, and by the Church it is manifest that it is more in the Church, then in the Pope. What that learned wrighter sayth of the Churches power in comparison with the Pope, holds in all other parallell instances.* ANSVV. Firſt, had Mr Dav. repeated this Argument of D. Whitaker fully and justly as it is set downe by himself, then might the Reader have seen therein a plaine & evident testimony for the authority of Synods; but divers things being omitted in the beginning, middle and end of it, thereby the trueth is obscured and hidden from his Readers.

(g) Apol. reply. p. 237. 238. Whit. de Cõci. quest. 5. Argum.

In the beginning of it, D. Whitaker propounds it thus, *If the fullnes of power be in the Church, not in the Pope, then it is evident, that it hath more authority then the Pope: but the first is true: therefore the second also.* Now by the Church in this place, he meaneth the Generall Synod or Councell, as appeares by the title of this Question noted in the beginning of it, viz. (h) *Whether the Synod be above the Pope:* and if he had not so meant it, this his Argument had bene beside the Question. And therefore while D. Whitaker here directly concludeth *a fullnes of power* in Synods, and as he further calles it in this same place, *that highest authority and jurisdiction which Christ hath left unto his Church*; it is manifest hereby that he did not hold them to be onely for counsell & admonition; and so was farre from limiting all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction unto a particular Congregation.

(h) De Concil. Qu. 5. c. 1. with c. 3. Arg. 5.

In the middle, in the confirmation of this Argument, D. Whit. saith, *For if all this power were in the Pope, or in any one man principally and essentially, then he dying it should perish, and so the Church should altogether loose it. But it is not lost, though the Pope dye a thousand times, but it remaineth with the Church, without which the Pope though living could have no part of this authority.* Now to argue on this manner against the authority we ascribe unto Synods, by comparing them with particular Churches, as he doth against the Pope compared with Synods, would be inconsequent, unequall, and no parallell instance; because the title of the Church is no where given unto the Pope, or unto any one person, as it is unto an assembly of Ministers,

Governours, or Deputies of Churches met together in the name of Christ in Synods: because though we ascribe unto Synods some jurisdiction, yet we doe not say that all power is in them originally, and so to be derived unto others as is sayd of the Pope; and consequently because there is no such danger that the power of the Church should be lost and perish by the death of such as are members of the Synod, as might be by the death of the Pope, if all power were primarily and essentially in him alone. And therefore it is a vaine assertion of Mr Dav. touching this argument of D. Whit. viz. *What that learned wrighter sayth of the Churches power in comparison with the Pope, holds in all other parallell instances.*

In the end of this Argument prosequuted by D. Whitak. he concludeth thus: *Wherefore seeing it is certaine that this power is given unto the Church primarily, and not unto the Pope but secondarily and by accident, and seeing the Church is represented in the Synod: it is of necessity that the Synod must be above the Pope.* And thus most evidently he grants unto the Synod, as being a representative Church, a power & jurisdiction above the Pope, a power which consists in binding and loosing, shutting & opening, retaining and remitting of sinnes, as himself here explaines it, and so is directly contrary to them which allow no more unto Synods, but counsell and admonition. Why did Mr Davenp. omit and refuse to name the Synod, which D. Whit. so expressely mentioneth, applying & yeelding unto the Synod that power which he there pleades for?

Secondly, as for that similitude of fire and water, though it be granted that heat is more principally in the fire then in the water, because it is in the water by reason of the fire: yet hereby heat is not denyed to be in the water, but on the contrary acknowledged to be derived into the water; and experience shewes that by the heat so communicated unto the water many excellent effects are produced for the service of man. And so when Ecclesiasticall authority is by the Church committed and communicated to Ecclesiasticall Officers in calling of them, then doth it belong unto them, though secondarily and lesse principally, as both D. Whita. confesseth & Mr Dav. himself repeateth.

THat it may yet further appeare how unjustly the name of *D. Whitaker* is pretended and alledged both by Mr Dav. here, & by Mr Canne hereafter, against the authority of Synods, I will here set downe divers pregnant assertions and expresse testimonies of his, gathered out of sundry of his writings for help of the Readers. In them all may see how fully opposite he was to my opposites. To beginne with this treatise *de Conciliis*, of Councells or Synods, out of which Mr D. took this allegation above-mentioned: This book comprehends 6 Questions touching Synods; & in handling every one of these Questions, he speakes plainly for the authority & jurisdiction of Synods. These 6 Questions are

1. *Touching the necessity and profit of Synods.*
2. *By what authority they are to be assembled.*
3. *Of what persons they consist.*
4. *Who is to be Præsident in them.*
5. *Whether they be above the Pope.*
6. *Whether they can erre.*

For

For the first Question, touching the necessity of Synods: There he brings 8 reasons to prove the necessity and profit of them. I will not insist upon each of them as I might, but mention onely one or two of them. The third cause is, *sayth* „ *he*, (i) that εὐταξία, or good order, and right and lawfull discipline may both „ be appointed and maintained, and that Canons may be made and confirmed. „ For the Church hath alwayes had authority of making and enacting Ecclesiasti- „ call lawes, and of prescribing them to others, and of punishing those which did „ not observe them. And this authority hath alwayes bene accounted necessary. This was more then counselling or admonishing. (k) The eight and last, and that „ the chiefest cause *of Synods* is, that even as in Politick and Civill judgements „ malefactours upon examination are accused and condemned; so in the Church „ Hereticks might be condemned and pronounced anathema by publick judge- „ ment, and that the trueth might be vindicated from their calumnies. But as „ there, judgement is not to be given according to the will of the judge, but ac- „ cording to law: so here Hereticks, enemies of faith and religion, are not to be „ condemned but according to the publick and Imperiall law, that is, the Scrip- „ ture. For a Synod is as it were a publick Court, or Imperiall Chamber, or Par- „ liament, wherein the Judges hearing both sides do give sentence, and decree „ matters of greatest weight. For although Hereticks may be condemned of se- „ verall Churches apart: yet when they are condemned as it were of the whole „ Church, the sentence is more solemne and of greater weight. So Arius was „ condemned first of Alexander and the Councell at Alexandria, but afterward „ with greater authority by the Synod of Nice, &c. By these words of D. Whi- taker we may see what wrong they doe unto him, which pretend that he should deny the jurisdiction of Synods. I.

(i) Whitak. de Conc. q. 1, c. 3. p. 18.

(k) P. 21.

The second Question is, by whose authority Synods are to be assembled. Here D. Whitaker relating how Bellarmine pleads for the Popes authority, (l) repeats his 4th Argument, taken from an ancient Canon wherein it was concluded, *that without the minde of the Romane Bishop it was not lawfull to celebrate or hold Synods.* D. Whit. answers that this Canon mentioned by (m) Socrates, is not rightly transla- ted: he sayth, ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν, doth not signify *celebrare Concilia, to hold Synods*, as Cassiodorus hath ill translated it, whose translation they abuse; nor yet *Ecclesias consecrare, to consecrate Churches*, as Illyricus doth amisse translate it, but *leges Ecclesiasticas sancire, et canones Ecclesiis præscribere, to ordaine Ecclesiasticall lawes, & to prescribes Canons unto Churches.* And being thus translated, he sayth, *We acknowledge & approve this Canon, as most just. For reason it self teacheth & telleth, that that which con- cerneth all, ought to be approved of all. Therefore it was meet that those Canons which should be generall, should be approved also of the Bishop of Rome, who was one of the chief Bishops.* Now if D. Whita. allow that Canon to be most just, which grants unto Synods an authority of making Ecclesiasticall lawes and enjoyning the Churches to keep them, then it is manifest hereby that he confessed the jurisdiction of Synods, and that they were not onely for counsell & admonition. II.

(l) De Cõc. q. 2 c. 2. p. 42, &c.

(m) Lib. 2, cap. 8.

And in the same place D. Whitak. (n) relates how the Bishops of the Orientall Chur-

(n) P. 45, 46

Churches meeting together in a Synod at Antioch, did by common sentence write unto *Iulius* the Bishop of Rome, and by way of rebuke sayd unto him, that *they were not to be overruled by him, that if they would cast any out of their Churches,* μὴ δεῖν κανονίζεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶ, *that such ought not to be restored of him, even as those whom he cast out could not be restored of them.* Although D. Whit. acknowledge the errours and faults of some that were in that Synod, yet he approveth this their writing in reproof of Julius, and sayth, *they all did gravely rebuke his arrogance & insolence.* Though that Synod abused their power in censuring Athanasius unjustly, yet that they had a power of censure, & casting out of their Churches, is not denyed, but maintained against the Bishop of Rome.

III. The third Question is touching the persons whereof Synods doe consist. Here (o) D. Whit. (o) first describes the Popish opinion, and reckons up the foure sorts of persons, whom they allow to come unto Synods, namely, that *Some are present as judges, who have a determining voyce: Others, to dispute and examine difficulties, and these have a consultative voyce: Others, to defend the Synod, and to see that peace be kept within & without: Others, to serve as notaries, watchmen, servants.* Then he shewes that they allow *onely the greater Prelates, that is, all Bishops and Archbishops to have the right of a determining voyce in universall and particular Synods ordinarily, but that Cardinals, Abbots, Generalls of Orders, though they be not Bishops, yet by extraordinary priviledge may also have a determining suffrage: as for all others whatsoever they be, they may be profitable, but not have a determining voyce or suffrage.* After this he shewes the opinion of the Protestants, that not onely the greater Prelates, but whatsoever learned and godly men are sent, being chosen by the Churches of severall Provinces, and judged fit for that busines, *ought to have equall authority in giving suffrages*, and so to be judges as well as any others. But had D. Whit. bene of my opposites minde, he should have condemned each of these opinions, both of Papists and Protestants, and should have sayd that neither one nor other sorts of persons were to be admitted for judges in Synods, but onely for counsellours and admonishers: that none of them were to have determining voyces or to give definitive sentence, but onely to shew their advise, & to have a consultative voyce.

(o) De Cõci. Qu. 3. c. 1.

When Bellarmine alledgeth that the Prelates onely, as being Pastours of the Church are to have definitive voyces; D. Whit. answering his arguments, sayth, (p) *The end of Synods is not to feed*, viz. by teaching as proper pastours, *but to decide controversies, to prescribe Canons, to correct abuses, to order Churches, and to doe other things, which belong unto the peaceable and quiet state of the Church.* Herein he yeelds unto Synods not onely advise for direction, but jurisdiction and power of correction, &c.

(p) Ibid. c. 2 p. 85.

To prove this authority of Presbyters or Elders, he alledgeth *Act.* 16. 4. where there is mention of the decrees, ordained by the Apostles and Elders, and sayth thereupon, (q) *Who dare now denye the Elders to have had a determining suffrage? They did not onely dispute or consult, but did also judge and decree together with the Apostles. For the word,* * κεκριμένα *is equally applyed unto both. These things are so manifest that no man can gainsay it.* To this end also he argueth (r) that *a Generall Synod represents the*

(q) Ibid. c. 3. p. 96. 97.

* determined, ordained.

(r) P. 102, 103.

the Vniverſall Church: that *whoſoever is ſent of a Church, repreſents the perſon of that Church.* And finally (ſ) from ancient hiſtories he alledgeth the examples of divers Synods, as of Chalcedon, Nice, and Conſtantinople, wherein this power & juriſdiction was exerciſed. (ſ) P. 103, 104, &c.

IV. A fourth Queſtion is about the Præſident of Synods. In this diſpute, Bellarmine alledging that *Conſtantine profeſſed himſelf to be ſubject unto the Biſhops, and that he ought to be judged of them*; D. Whitaker allowing and commending that profeſſion, anſwereth and ſayth, (t) *What then? This hindereth not but that he might be Præſident. For if a Biſhop had bene Præſident, ought he not to have bene judged of other Biſhops? What godly Prince would not have ſayd ſo?* Hereby he acknowledgeth, that juriſdiction & authority of judgement is no undue power of Synods, and that even the worthieſt perſons ought to be ſubject thereunto. (t) De Cõc. q. 4 c. 3. p. 132.

V. A fift Queſtion is whether Synods be above the Pope. Here D. Whitaker having firſt ſhewed what the Popiſh opinion is, he then declares the opinion of the Proteſtants, and ſayth, (v) *Seeing the Pope is the Biſhop onely of one Chuch, he is not onely not ſuperiour unto all Biſhops aſſembled together, but not ſo much as ſuperiour unto any of them apart. Therefore we ſay that a Synod may alſo decree againſt the will of the Pope, may take cognition of the Popes cauſe, may judge the Pope, & compell him unto order, may preſcribe lawes unto the Pope, which are to have force againſt his will, and finally may condemne the Pope and deprive him of his office, if he be worthy of ſuch a puniſhment.* Now if a Synod have this power to judge, cenſure and depoſe the Popes, then hath it as much power to judge and cenſure other Miniſters and members of other Churches, unleſſe it can be ſhewed that they have more authority then the Pope, or ſome ſtrange priviledge to exempt them from that juriſdiction of Synods, whereunto others are in ſubjection. (v) De Cõc. q. 5. c. 1. p. 146.

Afterwards (x) he brings 10 Arguments to prove the ſuperiority of Synods above the Pope. And in them there be plenteous evidences touching the authority of Synods. Thoſe arguments which prove that the Synods have juriſdiction over the Pope and power to cenſure him, doe alwayes prove that Synods have juriſdiction and power of cenſure. Otherwiſe, though the Pope deſerved cenſure, yet it ſhould be an uſurpation in the Synod, to doe that for which they had no calling nor warrant: even as in the execution of Civill judgments, it ſhould be a preſumptuous and unlawfull uſurpation, if private men being no Magiſtrates ſhould take upon them to puniſh malefactours, though they had juſtly deſerved the ſame. (x) Ibid. c. 3

Not to inſiſt upon many other things which out of thoſe 10 Arguments might be alledged for our purpoſe, I will onely inſtance in one example that is there (y) urged by D. Whitaker, and taken out of Sozomen, *lib.* 4. *c.* 15, *or as in ſome editions,* c. 14. who recordes that the Synod of *Syrmium* made an Act, whereby *Fœlix* the Biſhop of Rome was appoynted to admit *Liberius* to be his fellow in the adminiſtration of the Romane Church. Hence D. Whitak. inferres, *So it ſeemed good unto the Synod: therefore the Synod was above the Pope and above that Church.* Bellarmine anſwers, *The Synod did not command, but onely exhort Fœlix by letters, that he would ſuffer Liberius to ſit with him.* D. Whit. replyes againe, *Touching letters of exhortation, So-* (y) Ibid. p. 195, 156.

zomen makes no mention of them. He sayth onely, γράφωσι Φήλικι, &c. *They write unto Fœlix, &c. And that these letters were mandatory it appeares, because otherwise Fœlix would never have yeelded.* Thus we see from hence, that Synods have power (at least in the judgement of D. Whit.) not onely to exhort & admonish, which every Christian may doe, but also to prescribe & injoyne that which is equall & just, and so that others are to be subject thereunto.

VI. The sixt and last Question is, whether Synods can erre. Now lest any should take occasion hereby to deny the authority of Synods, it is to be observed, that D. Whitaker doth in like manner affirme, that any lawfull assembly, even of those that are met together in the name of Christ, may erre also. He sayth, (a) *Though Christ be in the midst of them which are assembled in his name, it followes not, that they doe not erre: For all are not free from errour with whom Christ is present. And truely two or three which meet in the name of Christ, may be deceived, may erre in many things, and may aske those things which are not to be asked, and so be disappointed of their hope, and yet Christ be among them. For Christ doth not alwayes exempt them from errour, with whom he is.* Wherefore seeing every Ecclesiasticall assembly, every Eldership, and every particular Church, being subject to errour, and erring often, are not yet deprived of their jurisdiction and power in the judgement of causes: so though Synods want infallible judgement, and erre sometimes, yet are they not therefore without jurisdiction and authority. But further he avoucheth plainly that Synods have judiciall authority, when he sayth, (a) *A Synod is sayd to doe lawfully, not onely when it condemneth and excommunicateth those which are to be condemned & pronounced Anathema, but also when it ordaines and maintaines those decrees which agree with the Scripture, &c.* Had he bene of my opposites opinion he should have sayd the contraty, viz. that a Synod may not lawfully excommunicate or condemne those that deserve to be condemned, but onely admonish them, and so leave them to others. Yea he proceeds further, & sayth concerning Generall Synods, that (b) *In them is a soveraigne power, and they have the highest authority in the Church.* He doth not onely grant unto them jurisdiction, but greater then is in any particular Church, or in any other Ecclesiasticall judicatory.

(z) De Cõc. q. 6. c. 2. p. 216.

(a) Ibid. c. 3. p. 322.

(b) Ibid. p. 270.

Moreover, whereas Bellarmine maintaines that Synods cannot erre when they are approved and confirmed of the Pope, and that all their authority depends upon him; hereupon D. Whita. argueth thus against him: (c) *If there be such weight in the Pope, that without him neither Provinciall nor Generall Synod have in them any force, it may worthily be demanded, what part the Bishops have in a Synod, whether they be onely admonishers or counsellours, or whether they be judges? for if they be counsellours onely, why are none but Bishops admitted unto Synods? why not others rather who are more learned then Bishops? &c.* He notes it as a poynt of great absurdity, and as a great strait whereunto the Papists are brought, against their will & against their profession, that Bishops should have no other place in Synods but of admonishers and counsellours. For indeed what use is their of suffrages, of definitive and determining voyces, if in the end all be determined by the Pope? why might not advises and counsels have sufficed in such case? This observation D. Whitaker holds to be of speciall use, and worthy to be remembred, and therefore repeats it oft. (d) *What place (I*

(c) Ibid. c. 1. p. 214.

(d) Ibi. c. 2. p. 221, 222.

pray

pray you) doe Biſhops obtaine in Synods? what doe they? to what end doe they meet? Is it that they may judge, or is it that they may onely counſell and admoniſh? Are they therefore judges, or are they onely admoniſhers & counſellours? This indeed ſome of them thinke, that they may onely admoniſh in Synods, that they may move queſtions and diſpute, but may not judge. Naclantus Biſhop of Clug (as we taught before) in his treatiſe de poteſtate Papæ & Concilii, ſayth, The power of the Pope is royall, the power of the Synod is *conſiliaria*, by way of counſell; the power of the Pope is altogether definitive, the power of the Synod is of ambulatory definition, *that is, as I interpret it, wandring & uncertaine. Bellarmine indeed, and the Ieſuites that now are, hold that the Biſhops are judges, but doubtles they meane an ambulatory judgement, that is, none at all. For indeed they give all judgement unto the Pope alone.* Now this abſurd opinion which he notes to have bene the conceit of Naclantus, expreſſed in plaine words, and of Bellarmine and other Papiſts by conſequence, is even the ſame that is profeſſed by Mr Jacob, Mr Dav. & Mr Cann. for though they differ in reſpect of the power of the Pope, yet in reſpect of the power belonging to Synods, they make the perſons whereof the Synods conſiſt, to be no other then admoniſhers or counſellours, not having any juriſdiction at all. D. Whitaker yet leaves it not thus, but ſpeaking againe of the Popes over-ruling of Synods, he doth againe record this obſervation, ſaying, (e) *Certainly this is that which we ſayd before, that Biſhops aſſembled in a Synod, are not judges, but onely admoniſhers, that the Pope alone is judge of all controverſies, that the reſt have no authority. For if Biſhops were judges, judgement ſhould be done according to the greateſt number, and the ſentence of the moſt judges ſhould prevaile.* We may think that D. Whitaker was guided by a ſpeciall providence of God, and directed by his Spirit, thus particularly and remarkably aforehand to poynt out and commend to our conſideration this evill conſequent of making Synods to be onely admoniſhers or counſellours; that ſo we might have his writing for a Teſtimony againſt this errour, which within a while after was to be broached & made common by Mr Jacob, and ſome others; that which the Browniſts had done before, being neither ſo commonly knowne nor regarded.

(e) Ibid. c. 3. p. 267.

VNto this his writing *De Conciliis*, we may adde his treatiſe *De Pontifice Romano*, in which controverſy he diſcuſſeth 8 queſtions; and in the moſt of them he gives teſtimony for the authority of Synods, againſt my oppoſites. The Queſtions be theſe:

1. *Whether the government of the Church be Monarchicall.*
2. *Whether any Monarchy of the Church was ſetled in Peter.*
3. *Whether Peter was Biſhop of Rome, and dyed there.*
4. *Whether the Biſhop of Rome ſucceed Peter in a Monarchy Eccleſiaſticall.*
5. *Whether the Pope be Antichriſt.*
6. *Whether the Pope can erre in the faith.*
7. *Whether the Pope can make lawes to binde the conſcience.*
8. *Whether Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction be given by Chriſt to the Pope immediately.*

I.

In handling the firſt Queſtion, whereas the Papiſts require a Monarch to keep inferiour Officers in order and unity, D. Whitaker ſayth, (f) *If any will not doe their duety, and diſcharge their office, they are to be admoniſhed and rebuked, and except they obey, they*

(f) De Pont. Rom. q. 1. c. 2. p. 19.

they are at length to be removed by the judgement of the Church, or the Synod, or the Christian Magistrate: and there are knowne meanes enough of keeping Ministers in their duety, and the Church in unity, without a Pope. He acknowledgeth that Synods have not onely power to admonish, which every Christian may doe, but after admonition to censure & remove or depose the obstinate.

When Bellarmine to prove the superiority of Bishops, objects 1. *Tim.* 5. *Those that sinne rebuke before all*. D. Whit. answers, (g) *This equalls also may doe. So of old, if any Elder or Bishop was accused, the Bishops brought the matter unto an Ecclesiasticall Senate or Synod, and if he did seeme worthy of it, they condemned him by a publick judgement, that is, they eyther suspended, or excommunicated, or deposed him.* He declares (h) that the Church hath bene preserved in greatest tempests and troubles by Synods, and commends them for their use of jurisdiction in judging of causes, and shewes how those that would not yeeld unto such authority, were removed from their places, and others amended by their examples. He sayth, (i) *Though one alone could not judge of another, yet a Synod, and as it were a Senate or Session of Bishops hath had the right and power to take cognition and judge of their causes.* He observeth againe out of Cyprian, (k) *No Bishop could be judge of another: of another (I say) not of others, because a Synod of Bishops could alwayes judge a Bishop: therefore the Monarchicall primacy of the Romane Bishop is of no divine right.* As he doth fully condemne the usurpation of one Bishop above another, so by way of opposition he doth fully and plentifully avouch the authority of many, meeting together in Synods, not onely for counsell & admonition, but for jurisdiction in judging & censuring of offendours.

(g) Ibid. p. 43.

(h) P. 48. & 49.

(i) P. 92.

(k) P. 93.

II. After this, in the prosequution of the second Question, Bellarmine pleading for the Monarchy and jurisdiction of Peter, because he in speciall was charged to feed the sheep of Christ, and among other Pastorall acts, noting this for one, *to judge controversies:* D. Whit. answers, (l) *What controversies? Of religion? But the other Apostles did that also as well as he: and the Synods of Bishops and learned men can doe this, even as we read that it hath often bene practised in the Churches for many ages, before this principality of the Pope was brought into the Church.*

(l) DePont. Rom. q. 2. c. 7. p. 229.

Furthermore, D. Whitaker useth this argument to prove a superiority of power in a company or assembly of the Apostles above one or two of them: (m) *The Apostles send Peter to Samaria: therefore Peter was not the head of the Apostles, but rather was in subjection unto their authority. Act.* 8. 14. He sayth, *A sending doth alwayes and necessarily imply a subjection in him that is sent, if he be sayd properly to be sent.* This manner of reasoning makes for the authority of Synods, consisting of a company of Ministers or other Deputies of Churches orderly assembled, whiles he argueth that a Colledge or company of the Apostles had superiority of power over some singular persons among them, though considered apart they were all equall in power. He sayth concerning Peter & Iohn, (n) *We read that both of them were sent by the Colledge of the Apostles: from whence we doe justly conclude both that these two Apostles were equall, & that the authority of sending was in the Apostles.* He shewes also (o) that the decree made in the Synod, *Act.* 15. was not confirmed by the authority of Peter alone, but by common consent of the Apostles & the Church, for the repressing of false Apostles, &c.

(m) Ibid. p. 260.

(n) P. 261.

(o) P. 297. 297.

In

In the examination of the fourth Queſtion, whereas Bellarmine would have a double errour to be obſerved: one, of thoſe who teach that the Pope may be judged, puniſhed, and depoſed by the Emperour, if he diſcharge not his office aright; another, of them that maintaine he may be judged and cenſured by a Synod of Biſhops, though not by a ſecular Prince: D. Whitaker anſwereth, (p) *We acknowledge both of theſe, but we ſay there is no errour here. For the Biſhop of Rome may be depoſed, both by the Emperour, when there is cauſe, and by a Synod of Biſhops, and that not onely Generall, but Particular of that Province; whereunto Calvine moſt truely affirmeth him to be ſubject, and that he may be judged of it: and thoſe that perſwade the Pope otherwiſe, we affirme them to be flatterers & paraſites, rebels to God & the Emperour.* And many the like aſſertions he hath in the handling of that queſtion, wherein the juriſdiction of Synods is witneſſed by him. IV. (p) Ibid. qu. 4. p. 513, 514.

In the fift Queſtion concerning Antichriſt, (q) he notes it to be an evidence of Antichriſtian pride in the Pope, that he is by the Jeſuites affirmed to be *above the Synod*. V. (q) Ibid. q. 5. p. 674, 675.

Proceeding to the ſixt Queſtion, touching the errours of Popes, (r) he avoucheth the juriſdiction of Synods, by alledging many examples and inſtances wherein they exerciſed this power; as in the condemning of Pope Honorius, Gregory the 7th, or Hildebrandus, John the 23th, Eugenius, &c. VI. (r) Qu. 6. p. 797. 805. 812, 813.

Touching the ſeventh Queſtion, about the Popes making of lawes to binde the conſcience, though D. Whitaker teach that it belongs to God alone to give lawes unto the conſcience: yet he ſayth, (ſ) *The Church hath authority of making lawes concerning decency, & it is our duety to obey, yet concerning the things themſelves the conſcience is alwayes free, &c.* He addes, *Whereas the adverſary ſaith, that all true lawes have a coactive* or conſtraining *force: if he ſo underſtand it, that they conſtraine & burden the conſcience, with reſpect unto the things themſelves, it is falſe. for certainely even theſe alſo doe conſtraine after a ſort, to wit, if we have reſpect unto the generall rule, ſo that if there come contempt or offence or ſchiſme, the violation of them cannot be excuſed.* Againe he ſaith to like purpoſe, (t) *Whereas Bellarm. ſayth, we can abide no lawes, therein he doth egregiouſly ſlander: for we allow & much eſteeme of lawes, even Eccleſiaſticall lawes, & do teach that they are to be obeyed, & do ſubject our ſelves unto them: but we will not that our conſciences be bound or enſnared, nor the liberty which Chriſt hath giv̄, to be taken from us.* How the Church exerciſeth this power of making lawes, he explaineth (v) elſwhere, namely in Synods. And ſeeing here he teacheth obedience and ſubjection unto them, it is plaine that he allowes unto Synods a greater authority then onely of admoniſhing or counſelling. This he expreſſeth more plainly, even in this Queſtion alſo, when he ſayth, (x) *It is lawfull for Synods, both Generall & Provinciall, to make lawes and to ordaine certaine rites which belong unto good order and the outward policie of the Church; and they are to be depoſed which doe not keep the ſame: but our conſciences are not bound with thoſe lawes, except contempt & ſcandall be added, as was ſayd before.* VII. (ſ) Qu. 7. p. 853. (t) P. 867. (v) De Cōc. q. 1. c. 3. p. 18. (x) De Pont. Rom. q. 7. p. 849.

SECT. XI. *His Allegation of Chamierus examined.*

BEſides theſe Allegations ſet downe in his *Apologeticall Reply*, there remaineth yet to be conſidered of us the teſtimony of *Daniel Chamierus*, another learned man, whom Mr Dav. had cited before any of theſe, to wit, in his letter which

he ſent to the Claſſis, printed by W. B. ſaying, (y) *The power of every particular Church, is chief in its owne particular matters, (or in things which are proper to it ſelf) as a Synod hath the chief power, in things that are common to many Churches, witneſſe Chamier. cont. Bell. lib. 2.*

(y) Book of compl. p. 2.

Answv. The quotation of this Teſtimony is imperfectly deſcribed, ſo that men cannot finde the ſame, by the direction he gives, there being many ſecond bookes in thoſe 4 Tomes of that great work, each of them contayning many chapters, and none of them ſpecifyed by him. It ſeemes he took this teſtimony from Mr Parker, who hath alſo imperfectly cited the ſame: for though he mention not onely the ſecond book, but alſo pag. 193. yet is not that teſtimony there to be found. But whereſoever it is, he might have * found in Mr Parker ſufficient anſwer and ſatiſfaction for it, while he addeth three other cauſes wherein the authority of Synods is ſuperiour unto particular Churches, wherein is expreſſed & contained as much power as we aſſcribe unto Synods.

* See before, pag. 92, 93.

But that it may further appeare how Mr Dav. is condemned by his owne witneſſe, it is to be conſidered touching this famous light of Gods Church, that as he (z) undertook that great work at the appoyntment and command of a Synod; as his ſonne *Adr. Chamierus* after his fathers death dedicated that work unto the excellent and faythfull ſervants of God, the Paſtours and Elders of the French Churches aſſembled in a Nationall Synod, comparing them to *the threeſcore valiant men of the valianteſt in Iſrael, compaſſing the bed of Salomon, all holding ſwords, expert in warre, every man with his ſword upon his thigh: becauſe of feare in the night; Sol. ſong. c. 3. 7, 8.* and as againe ſpeaking of the Synod, he applyes unto them that which is ſayd of the *Tower of David*, where the ſhields of the mighty men are hanged up, &c. *Sol. ſong. 4. 4.* ſo in the book itſelf there are many ample and pregnant teſtimonies touching the authority & juriſdiction of Synods.

(z) Epiſt. Dedicat.

And firſt of all, where he proves that the government of the Church is Ariſtocraticall, by many, and not Monarchicall, by one, he makes this diſtinction, (a) *The government of Churches is either of ſeverall Churches, or of many together*, viz. by Synods. In both he maintaines an Ariſtocracie or juriſdiction of many. He doth not reſtraine juriſdiction to particular Congregations, and allow onely counſell or adviſe to Synods: but he uſeth the ſame words and phraſes to deſcribe the power and government of one ſort as well as of the other, to note a like kinde of authority in both.

(a) Chamie. Panſtrat. Cath. Tom. 2. l. 10. c. 5.

For the government of many Churches together in a Province, he ſayth, (b) *For the diſpoſing and directing of publick affaires, Provinciall Synods were appointed, that is, companies of Biſhops in the ſame Province, which were aſſembled ſo often as need & commodity required.* For evidence thereof he alledgeth divers Canons, & commendeth Cyprian for obſerving that order.

(b) Ibid. c. 7.

Touching the adminiſtration of all Churches in the world, he ſayth; (c) *He that denyeth theſe to have bene governed by Vniverſall Synods, muſt be either notoriouſly impudent, or ignorant of all antiquity. For in the very beginnings, when a great queſtion was rayſed about the rites of Moſes, and ſome would have thoſe that were converted from heathenish Idolatry, to be ſubjected unto them, Luke teſtifyeth that a Synod was aſſembled, Act. 15.*

(c) Ibid. c. 8.

The

The Apoſtles and Elders came together to looke unto this matter. *And by the authority of this Synod, that queſtion was compounded; which authority that they might ſignify to be the greateſt, the decree is conceived in theſe words,* It ſeemed good unto the holy Ghoſt and to us. And that this was an Oecumenicall or Univerſall Synod, he there maintaineth by divers reaſõs againſt *Ioverius*, who in regard of the ſmall number that met together, affirmed it to be a particular Synod.

It ſeemes alſo that this was the place from whence Mr Parker took that which he alledged out of *Chamierus*, becauſe in theſe two chapters, 7. & 8. are contained thoſe teſtimonies which he citeth. And here it is that he ſpeakes of *cauſa communis*, or the common cauſe, which Cyprian would have to be judged by a Synod. And here it is that he ſpeakes of ſome proper cauſes, belonging peculiarly to ſome Biſhops in their ſpeciall charges, viz. c. 7. But theſe things are not onely miſquoted by Mr Dav. by putting the 2d book for the 10th, but the ſenſe is altered, while Chamierus comparing Biſhops with Metropolitanes, reſtraines ſome things from Metropolitanes to ſuch Biſhops as had divers countries under them. And though he ſhew how Cyprian brought a common cauſe unto the Synod, yet he doth not affirme that onely ſuch common cauſes were to be brought unto Synods. Chamierus doth not witneſſe that *the power of every particular Church is chief in its owne particular matters*, as Mr D. alledgeth him for witneſſe thereof. And in c. 8. he brings many evidences to witneſſe the power of Generall Synods in judging the cauſes of all Churches.

Againe in the Queſtion whether the Biſhop of Rome may be judged of any, Chamierus ſhewes the opinion of the Proteſtants, whom he calleth Catholicks in oppoſition to the Papiſts, that (d) *No Biſhop at all may by divine right be judged of another; but of many, to wit in a Synod, ſo as it hath moſt often bene done.* And when Bellarmine objected the examples of ſome Synods, that refuſed to judge the Biſhop of Rome, Chamierus anſwereth, that ſome of them were *particular Synods, conſiſting onely of ſuch as were under the Romane. Therefore they could make no generall decree; but could onely ordaine that the Biſhop of Rome ſhould not be judged of them aſſembled in a particular Synod: which certainely they either did not ſpeak concerning a Generall Synod, or els they ſpoke falſely.* A plaine confeſſion of the juriſdiction of Synods: for had he ſpoken of counſell or admonition onely, why might not any one particular Biſhop or Synod have admoniſhed the Pope upon occaſion, and given their adviſe touching him?

(d) Ibid. l. 13. c. 17.

In his diſpute touching Appeales, he ſayth, (e) *We doe not take away all appeales. For they are of common equity: and truely without them the Diſcipline of the Church could hardly or not at all ſubſiſt.* And he ſpeakes there of ſuch appeales as were made unto Synods. Afterward, ſpeaking of the impoſture or cooſenage of the Biſhop of Rome in the ſixt Councell of Carthage, where appeales denyed to Rome, are yet expreſſely allowed to be made *unto the Synods of their owne Province or to a Generall Councell:* hereupon Chamierus cryes out, (f) *Immane! quantam crucem &c. O how unſpeakable a croſſe is procured unto our Papiſts by the ſincere conſtancy of thoſe good fathers! among whom were thoſe great men, Aurelius of Carthage, and Auguſtine of Hippo, &c.* Now look what weight and ſtrength the teſtimony of thoſe African fathers hath

(e) Ibid. l. 14. c. 2.

(f) Ibid. c. 3.

hath against the Papists; even so much authority hath it against such as stand for the single, uncompounded policie, which deny the jurisdiction and power of Synods, to determine such causes as by appeales are brought unto them. For the jurisdiction of Synods in receiving appeales is in the same place as plainly confessed, as the jurisdiction of the Pope is denyed by their prohibition of appeales to be made unto him.

Againe when he proves that the Pope is subject to Ecclesiasticall judgement, he doth in the same question with one conclude that there is a superiority of power and jurisdiction in Synods to judge of him. He instanceth (g) in *Honorius a Bishop of Rome, who by the sixt Synod was not onely judged, but condemned as a Monothelite.* This was more then counsell or admonition. He shewes in the same place that *many lawes were made concerning Bishops, both of the Apostles and of Synods, which doe certainly binde all Bishops.* When Bellarmine answereth that the Pope is bound by Ecclesiasticall lawes *in respect of direction, not of coaction* (which distinction is in effect the same which our opposites use now, viz. that Synods may binde or be respected *for their counsell, not for their jurisdiction*) Chamierus replyeth againe and pleades that *the Bishop of Rome is subject unto those lawes, not onely for their direction, but for their coaction* or constraint, viz. in regard of Ecclesiasticall censures. He sayth further, *Even as particular Synods doe binde all the Bishops within their owne jurisdiction, so Vniversal Synods have power over all the Bishops of the whole world. Againe, because particular Synods doe binde all the Bishops of their owne Province: therefore the Bishop of Rome is subject unto the lawes, not onely of an universall, but also of his owne particular Synod.* Moreover he instanceth in divers particular lawes which the sixt Synod prescribed unto the Church of Rome, by name touching the permission of marriage, fasting, &c.

(g) Ibid. c. 10.

Moreover when Bellarmine and P. Auratus doe plead for the Popes supremacy, as being necessary to the unity of faith and the unity of the Church, &c. Chamierus answereth, (h) *Of old, when many heresies sprung up, they never ran unto any one man, by whose authority questions might be decided. When disputation was raysed against Paul and Barnabas touching Mosaicall ordinances, the Apostles called a Synod, Act. 15. which remedy the Church thence-forth used most diligently, as often as either heresies or schismes did break the unity thereof.* He alledgeth divers examples thereof, in speciall of Constantine, and Innocentius in the question about Chrysostome. And speaking of such Synods as used not onely counsell, but jurisdiction in censuring the guilty, such as was the Councell of Nice, he sheweth thence, they found *no other remedy fit enough to preserve Ecclesiasticall unity in faith & love, except a Generall Synod.* He sayth againe, *We understand that the best and most certaine meanes of nourishing unity is a Synod, not one Monarch.* And among others he alledgeth Ægidius Viterbiensis, who disputed on this manner; *Paul the glory of the Apostles, when he would shew the chief poynt of our salvation, sayth, Without faith we can by no meanes please God: but without Synods faith cannot stand: therefore without a Synod we cannot be safe.* And afterwards; *Whatsoever hath bene done in the Church worthy of praise, worthy of honour from the age of Melchiades, either to resist the enimy or to settle the Commonwealth, that all sprung from Synods and is againe to be referred unto Synods.* And many other things he there bringeth to maintaine the authority of Synods, without any shew that he ever light upon this dreame

(h) Lib. 9. c. 13.

dreame, that they were onely for counsell.

To conclude, whereas *Chamierus* was translated out of this life, before he had fully finished that great work of his *Panstratia Catholica*; and therefore for the finishing of it there is added unto his 4th Tome, a Supplement by *Alstedius*; in that Supplement there is also a plaine confession touching the authority of Synods. Therein *Alstedius* treading in the steps of Junius and D. Whitaker, (i) doth acknowledge that the originall of Synods is from divine right, alledging *Deut.* 17. *Act.* 1. & *ch.* 15. *Mat.* 18. Repeating the causes wherefore Synods are to be called, he doth not limit them to be for counsell onely, but that (k) *as malefactours in Civill judgements are tryed, accused & condemned, so in the Church obstinate Hereticks are by publick judgement to be condemned and excommunicated.* He allowes unto those that are lawfully called unto Synods, (l) *to have right of giving definitive sentence, and of determining matters according to the Scriptures.* He maintaines that Synods have authority over the Pope, and that (m) *he is bound to subject himself unto their judgement, discretive and coactive*; not onely to their counsell, but to their censure. And if these did not suffice, there are yet many other cleare testimonies which Alstedius there gives touching the jurisdiction of Synods.

(i) De Cõc. c. 1. sect. 6.

(k) Cap. 4. sect. 2.

(l) C. 5. s. 2.

(m) C. 10. s. 21.

CHAP. VI.

An answer to Mr Cannes Arguments.

FRom the Allegations of Mr Dav. we come now to the Argumentations of Mr Canne and his client, against the authority of Classes and Synods: and here first we will examine and consider their Syllogismes and Logicall formes of reasoning.

ARGVM. I. (a) *If those Churches, planted by the Apostolique institution, had power fully in themselves immediately from Christ, to practise all his ordinances: Then have all Churches the like power now. But the first is true: Therefore the second.*

(a) Churches plea, p. 68.

The Proposition is cleare & certaine, by these Scriptures, 1. Cor. 5. 2, 3. *Act.* 14. 23. 1. Cor. 16. 2. Col. 2. 5. 2. Thes. 3. 14.

The Assumption is acknowledged by sundry of our best Divines, &c.

ANSVV. I. The first maine fault in this Argument, common to many that follow, is, that herein is committed a foule fallacy, *ab ignoratione Elenchi*; that is to say, the Conclusion is beside the Question. This whole argument being granted, yet the authority of Synods remaines still firme, and unshaken thereby. When or where did I ever affirme that the Churches now have not the like power to practise all the ordinances of Christ, as fully as those Churches planted by Apostolick institution? The testimonies of learned men here alledged by him, to prove that the ancient and first institutions are to be preferred before later inventions, I doe willingly assent unto. But what can he conclude hence? Though Christ have committed power unto a particular Church, doth it therefore follow that if such abuse their power and goe astray, either wholy or the greater part of

it, there is then no Eccleſiaſticall authority above them, to cenſure them or to reſtraine them from proceeding in evill? This conſequence which had bene to the purpoſe, he offers not to prove. It was confeſſed (b) before by *Mr Cartwright*, one of his owne witneſſes here alledged by him, that *if any Church ſhould deſire or chooſe, or conſent upon by the moſt part, ſome that is unmeet, either for doctrine or manners, then the Miniſters and Elders of other Churches round about, ſhould adverriſe firſt, and afterwards as occaſion ſhould ſerve, ſharply & ſeverely charge, that they forbeare ſuch election, or if it be made, that they confirme it not, by ſuffering him to exerciſe any miniſtery.*

(b) Chap. 5. ſect. 1. p. 81.

II. A ſecond extraordinary and groſſe errour is to be obſerved in his Logick, while in the proſequution of his Argument, he not knowing which is the *Major* or which is the *Minor propoſition* in his owne Syllogiſme, that which ſhould be for the proofe of his *Minor propoſition*, that he applyes for proofe of the *Major*; that which ſhould ſerve for proofe of his *Major*, that he brings for confirmation of his *Minor*. The Scriptures which he alledgeth, he referres to the proofe of his miſ-named *Propoſition*: the Teſtimonies of Authors here alledged, he referres to the proofe of his miſ-called *Aſſumption*. This errour I doe the rather note. 1. Becauſe it is no ſlip or overſight in him through want of attention in this place, but an ordinary and frequent errour, as appeares in that which followeth. 2. Becauſe of his inſolent and arrogant boaſting againſt others, (c) for want of art, and want of wit, of Logick, &c. Who can relate unto us ſuch an example of a man profeſſing himſelf a Logicall Diſputant, with ſuch abundance of printed Syllogiſmes, with ſuch contempt of others, and yet to be ſo rude, as not to know the plaineſt things and the A. B. C. in Logick, the difference betwixt the *Major* and *Minor* in a Syllogiſme? 3. Becauſe of his ſpirituall pride, not onely in ſeparating himſelf from the Churches of Chriſt, as other Brownifts doe, but taking upon him to be their Paſtour, their guide, their champion for defence of their Separatiõ againſt all men. O miſerable men, that follow ſo blinde a guide!

(c) Churc. plea, p. 2, & 3. & 15. Neceſſ. of Sep. p. 188, 189.

III. A third errour in the proſequution of this Argument is this, that although the premiſſes of this argument being rightly underſtood, are granted to be true; yet the Scriptures alledged doe not prove the ſame. Though the Churches planted of the Apoſtles, had powerfully in themſelves immediately from Chriſt, to practiſe all his ordinances; yet theſe places, 1. *Cor.* 5. 2, 3. *Act.* 14. 23. 1. *Cor.* 16. 2. *Col.* 2. 5. 2. *Theſ.* 3. 14. doe onely prove their right for the practiſe of ſome of his ordinances, that are mentioned and poynted at in them, but not of all other. As for example; the adminiſtration of the Sacraments, though a right belonging to the Church, and ordained in other places of Scripture, yet is not ſpecifyed in any of theſe allegations. The liberty of appeales in caſe of oppreſſion, the power of ſending Deputies unto a Synod for the deciſion of difficult & weighty cauſes, are ordinances of Chriſt, and rights of the Church, as hath bene ſhewed before, & yet not ſpecifyed in any of theſe Scriptures alledged by him: and therefore his proof for all ordinances is defective.

IV. For the right underſtanding of this ſentence; viz. that *every Pariſh or every particular Church hath full or ſufficient authority within it ſelf, derived immediately from Chriſt, for the government of it ſelf in all Eccleſiaſticall cauſes*: I deſire the Reader to look

look back unto the explication thereof by (d) *Gerſom Bucerus*, who labouring to make the beſt interpretation thereof, yet ſhewes that it is not to be admitted without divers cautions, ſome whereof I have expreſſed * before. He undertakes the defence hereof againſt D. Downam, but no further then it may be ſo underſtood, and ſo expounded, as not containing in it any denyall or impeachment of the authority and juriſdiction of Claſſes and Synods, judging the cauſes of many Churches. And indeed how can any Church be ſayd to practiſe all the ordinances of Chriſt, ſo long as they refuſe and deny the combination of Churches, or the juriſdiction of them being combined, which is ſhewed to be one of his ordinances?

(d) Diſſe de Gub. Eccl. p. 14.
* P. 117, 118.

ARGVM. II. (e) *If Chriſt in Mat. 18. 17. where he ſayth*, Tell the Church; *doth meane a particular Congregation: Then hath every particular Congregation, an intire power, in, & of it ſelf, to exerciſe Eccleſiaſticall government, and all other Gods ſpirituall ordinances. But the firſt is true: Therefore the ſecond.*

(e) Churc. ploa. p. 69.

The Propoſition is cleare and certaine, maintained by the moſt Iudicious Divines, &c.

The Aſſumption is proved thus: That Church which Chriſt intendeth in Matt. 18. hath abſolute power in, & of itſelf to performe all Gods ordinances: But Chriſt intendeth in Mat. 18. a particular Congregation: Therefore every particular Congregation hath abſolute power, in, and of it ſelf, to performe all Gods ordinances, &c.

ANSVV. I. Here is the ſame fault that was in the former Argument, viz. of concluding beſide the queſtion. This argument being granted, there ariſeth hence no prejudice to the authority of Claſſes or Synods. The authority of particular Churches and the authority of Synods may well ſubſiſt together. The arrowes which are ſhot by Mr Canne are beſide the marke of the maine queſtion.

II. His argument is not onely beſide the mark, but as an arrow ſhot up into the ayre, and falling downe on his head againe, ſo doth his argument returne upon himſelf: for if a particular Church hath intire power, in and of itſelf to performe all Gods ordinances; then hath it power to unite itſelf with other Churches combined in Synods, and to ſubmit unto the judgement thereof, according to the divine warrant & ordinance. *Act. 15. 2, &c. Deut. 17. 8, &c.*

III. As before, ſo he blindely ſtumbles here againe at the ſame ſtone, in not diſcerning betwixt the Propoſition and Aſſumption of his owne Syllogiſme. The Authors which he alledgeth for the maintenance of his *Major propoſition*, ought to have bene applyed to the proofe of his *Aſſumption*, viz. to ſhew that *Chriſt in Mat. 18. 17. where he ſaith*, Tell the Church, *doth meane a particular Congregation*: for this is that which he aſſumes, when he ſayth, *But the firſt is true.* And all the ſhew of help which he hath from his Authors, tends to confirme this Aſſumption; but their teſtimonies are no direct proofe of his Propoſition.

IV. Another new groſſe errour in his Logicall diſpute, is this, that whereas he goes about to prove the Aſſumption of his firſt Syllogiſme, by framing a ſecond Syllogiſme, he doth not therein according to order conclude that which was his former Aſſumption, whether it be underſtood as it is indeed, or as he miſcalles it; but inſtead thereof he ridiculouſly repeates the Concluſion of his firſt Syllogiſme, which Concluſion is neither the Propoſition nor the Aſſumption

tion which he offers to prove; but the Queſtion made by him in his maine Argument. And thus entangling himſelfe with his owne Syllogiſmes, Propoſitions, and Aſſumptions, he hath brought himſelf into ſuch a maze, that he knowes not where he is, what he ſayth, nor whereof he affirmeth. Let Logicians tell how oft they have ſeene the like in print.

V. Whether all his Authors doe affirme that by the Church in *Mat.* 18. Chriſt meant a particular Congregation, I will not here examine: I ſhall have further occaſion in the next chapter to ſpeak of many of them. But in the meane time let it be granted, not onely that they have all ſo affirmed, but that it is the trueth: Yet doe they not all affirme, that *onely* a particular Congregation was intended by Chriſt, *Mat.* 18. For both the Elderſhip of a particular Church, and the Synod ariſing from the combination of many Churches, are ſhewed unto us in *Matt.* 18. the one for the judging of leſſer cauſes, without bringing them to the whole Congregation; the other for the deciding of weightier matters, which neither Elderſhip nor Congregation can ſo well end. And this is acknowledged by ſundry of his Witneſſes, whoſe names he abuſeth in this controverſy. Mr Parker, touching Mat. 18. ſayth, (f) *The Church of the faythfull is intended of Chriſt, not as it is ſimply conſidered (as we ſayd before) but as it exerciſeth Diſcipline according to an Ariſtocraticall temperament in the Elderſhip. For we doe think that the Church mentioned in the firſt place, in thoſe words*, Tell the Church, *doth preciſely ſignify the Ariſtocraticall part, that is, the Elderſhip: but that which is mentioned in the latter place, in theſe words*, If he heare not the Church, *if (as Downame teacheth) it include the Church excommunicating for contempt, and not onely decreeing or examining, then it doth alſo comprehend the Democraticall part of the Church, foraſmuch as the conſent of the people is neceſſary unto excommunication.* And a little before he ſayth (g) *Almoſt all interpreters doe agree, that thoſe words* [*in verſ.* 19.] If two or three, *doe containe an amplification from the leſſe to the greater, from a leſſe company to a greater: ſo that it is moſt plaine, that under the name of the Church be included as well the greater company, as that which conſiſts of two or three.* How Mr Parker proved the Synod alſo from *Mat.* 18. is ſhewed (h) before; where D. Whitaker, Mr Cartwright and others alſo teach the ſame thing.

(f) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. c. 15. p. 160.

(g) Ibid. p. 159.

(h) See Ch. 3. p. 45-49.

(i) Church. plea, p. 70.

ARGVM. III. (i) *Whatſoever was commanded to the 7 Churches to be practiſed by each of them, apart, in, and for themſelves; that no Church of God muſt now omit. But Eccleſiaſticall government, was commanded to the 7 Churches to be practiſed by each of them, apart, in, and for themſelves. Therefore no Churches of God muſt omit the practiſe of Eccleſiaſticall government, apart, in, and for themſelves.*

The Propoſition cannot be doubted of. For as Chytræus, &c.

The Aſſumption is proved clearly in chap. 2. verſ. 2, 14, 20. &c. Moreover Mr Perkins, &c.

ANSVV. I. This Argument for the forme of it, is a miſſhapen Syllogiſme, and that in a double reſpect; both becauſe the *Minor terminus* is ſuperfluouſly put into the *Major Propoſition*; and becauſe the ſame *terminus* is confuſedly joyned with the *Prædicate* in the *Minor propoſition*, when it ſhould have bene placed with the *Subject* therein. But this is one of the leaſt faults in Mr Cannes reaſonings.

II. For the matter of it, this Argument doth alſo come ſhort of the mark, & rea-

reacheth not home to the queſtion. And that which he concludes (being well underſtood) may be ſafely granted of us. That which Mr Canne alledgeth from Chytræus, Bullinger, Brightman & Perkins, for the proof of his Propoſition & Aſſumption, I doe willingly aſſent unto, and it was but an idle labour to bring them for proof of that which is not denyed. There be no Churches here among us which refuſe to practiſe Eccleſiaſticall government, *apart, in & for themſelves*. This they practiſe after a double manner; 1. There be many rebukes and cenſures againſt ſinne adminiſtred in them without the knowledge of Claſſis or Synod, apart, in and for themſelves. 2. When as more hard & weighty cauſes are brought unto the Deputies of other Churches, aſſembled in Claſſes, for their adviſe and judgement, even then alſo when upon their conſideration matters are cleared, and there remaineth no ſcruple, they are then remitted againe and referred unto the particular Churches, ſo that the Elderſhip with conſent of the Congregation proceedeth therein as they finde cauſe, according to the repentance or obſtinacy of the perſons with whom they have to deale: And ſo the ſentence is both determined and executed apart, in & for themſelves, without the Claſſis.

But if by government to be practiſed *apart, in and for themſelves*, he meane ſuch a ſolitary and ſeparate government, as refuſeth combination with other neighbour Churches, ſuch as admitteth no liberty of appeale in caſe of greateſt wrong, ſuch as excepteth a particular Congregation from the cenſure of all other Churches, though it ſhould erre never ſo perniciouſly, and in ſumme, ſuch a government *apart*, as denyeth all authority and juriſdiction of Claſſes and Synods; then is his Aſſumption moſt falſe: and all that he alledgeth for proofe thereof helpes him nothing. for 1. Though the Angel of the Church of Epheſus be commended for not bearing with the wicked, &c. and the Angel of the Church of Pergamus and Thyatira be reprehended for ſuffering divers enormities, *Rev.* 2. 2. 14. 20. by what good conſequence can theſe examples overthrow the authority of Synods? There might be occaſion at this day to write unto ſome Miniſters ſtanding under the Claſſes and Synods in theſe Reformed Churches, and ſome of them might juſtly be commended for their zeale in not bearing with the wicked; others might juſtly be reprehended for their negligence in tolerating of ſuch as offend: now Mr Canne according to this reaſoning, might as well conclude, againſt experience, & againſt the knowne trueth, that theſe Miniſters doe not ſtand under any Claſſicall government. 2. The praiſe or diſpraiſe which is given to the Angels of ſeverall Churches apart, doth not ſo much ſerve to argue an independency or diſunion in government in theſe Churches; but the very * forme of the viſion, in the union of theſe Starres of the Churches in Chriſts right hand, doth rather argue a conſociation of them for their mutuall help in the government of his Church. They appeare not ſcattered in the Firmament, but gathered and drawne together. What is a Claſſis or Synod, but as a Conſtellation of ſo many Starres of the Churches combined together, which by their conjunction together doe yeeld both a greater light of direction, and a ſtronger influence of authority, for the confirmation of the trueth and conviction of errour.

*Rev. 1. 16, 20. & 2. 1. & 3. 1.

And as for the teſtimony of Mr Perkins, though he acknowledge, (k) God hath

(k) Vpō Rev. 2, 20, & 3, 7

hath given to every Church *power and authority to preach the Word, administer the Sacraments, represse evill men, &c.* yet doth he not thereby exempt those Churches from the censure of others, if they be found to pervert the word, corrupt the Sacraments, and judge unrighteously. It is not probable that such a conceit did ever enter into Mr Perkins head, neither can it be collected from his words.

ARGVM. IV. *If the Church of Corinth, had power and authority within herself; to exercise Ecclesiasticall government; yea and did it, I meane the Ministery and the rest of the Church there: Then ought not particular Congregations now, to stand under any other Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves. But the first is true: Therefore the second.*

The first part is unquestionably certain; and of this judgement was D. Willet, &c.

ANSVV. That which he so boldly affirmeth to be *unquestionably certain*, viz. that which is indeed the first part of this Argument, is on the contrary most certainly false. This consequence of his *Major proposition* remaines to be proved. Scripture he alledgeth none at all, and for those eleven Authors mentioned by him, there is not one of them that confirmes his consequence. Why did he not expresse their words, & apply them to his purpose, & enforce thē against us, if he thought they would have served his turne? It is sayd to have bene a stratageme of theeves, that to affright men they have taken many hats and set them upon stakes afarre of, that passengers imagining them to be men, & partakers with those theeves that came unto them, might the sooner yeeld. Thus doth Mr Canne, who sets downe the names of many Authors and their writings in his marginall quotations, as if they were of his minde or partakers of his cause, when as there is no such matter to be found in them. Let us heare how he proceeds.

I. CAN. *Againe whereas the Papists and Hierarchy do say (much after Mr Pagets new doctrine) that the Church of Corinth had not sole and alone authority, in itself to exercise Ecclesiasticall government; our writers, viz.* (l) *Mr Cartwright*, (m) *Mr Parker & others refute them and prove the contrary by many reasons.*

(l) Ref. Rhem. 1. Cor. 5. 4.
(m) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. c. 4. p. 17, 18, &c.

ANSVV. That which he saith here of *sole and alone authority, &c.* is more then he propounded in his Syllogisme: I acknowledge that the Church of Corinth did exercise Ecclesiasticall government within herself; and I affirme as much for our owne and other particular Congregations here: and Mr Canne with as good reason might argue that we doe not stand under Classes and Synods, if there were any soundnes in his Syllogisme. My opinion touching the Church of Corinth may be discerned sufficiently by that which I noted touching the 7 Churches, in answer to his former argument. And as for Mr Cartwright and Mr Parker, whom he specially alledgeth, they help him not at all. I acknowledge Mr Parker doth justly oppose them that held, the Church of Corinth *did not excommunicate the incestuous person, but the Apostle alone*: But I doe more fully assent unto Mr Cartwright, who differing something from Mr Parker, and refuting the Rhemists most effectually by many reasons, doth yet withall shew, that the authority and power both of the Apostle and of the Church did concurre in this excommunication. Whereas the Rhemists would have the Corinthians to be onely witnesses, Mr Cartwright in his third reason against them, sayth, (n) *If the Church were assembled onely to beare witnesse, and not to have authority in this case: it followeth that* Paules

(n) Conf. of Rhem. upon 1. Cor. 5. 4.

spi-

ſpirit was there alſo onely to look on and beare witneſſe, conſidering that the perſonall preſence of the Church, and the Apoſtles ſpirituall preſence, are aſſociated in this affaire of the Church. Thus he joyneth both together: and ſo afterwards againe reaſoning from thoſe words, *Do not you judge of thoſe that are within?* 1.Cor. 5. 12. he ſayth thereupon that the Apoſtle *giveth more unto the Church in excommunication, then to be witneſſes and lookers on: For he uſeth the ſame* κρίνειν *word to declare the Churches intereſt, that he uſed before to note his owne. If then you will ſay, that the Churches judgement in excommunication is but to beare witneſſe: it followeth that the Apoſtles then, and conſequently their ſucceſſours now are onely to beare witneſſe of the excommunication. Hereunto commeth alſo that the releaſe of this cenſure is aſſcribed in the ſame word of* forgivenes *or abſolutiõ unto the Church as unto Paul. 2.Cor. 2. 10. Now to have the ſame word in the ſame verſe and the ſame cauſe to be underſtood diverſly, and referred to Paul to have the proper ſignification of remitting, but referred to the Church to ſignify* a witneſſing *of remiſſion: needeth more learning for the defence of it, then falleth unto the Ieſuites capacity.* Thus he ſhewes that neither the *ſole authority* of the Church on the one ſide, nor the *ſole authority* of Paul on the other ſide did determine this buſines. Againe, had there a dangerous contention riſen in Corinth, which by their ſole authority they could not end; what ſhould have hindred them from following the example of the Church at Antioch, in ſeeking help both by counſell and authority of other Churches for the judgement theteof?

κρίνειν. 1.Cor. 5. 3. 12.

I. CAN. *The latter part is proved before, in the Minors of the 1. and 3. arguments.*

ANSVV. It it manifeſt that he did not know the *Minor* from the *Major* in ſome of his former Syllogiſmes, and ſo in this place it appeares he doth not diſcerne the *firſt* from the *latter* part of his argument. But what he objected before is already anſwered: it is vaine & helples for him to rely upon his former poofes.

ARGVM. V. (o) *Such actions the Church may lawfully doe, wherein no Law of God is broken. But there is no Law of God broken, when particular Congregations doe in, & among themſelves exerciſe all Gods ordinances. Therefore they may lawfully doe it.*

(o) Churc. plea, p. 71.

The proof of the Propoſition, doth ariſe from the definition of ſinne; which as (p) *Auguſtine and* (q) *Ambroſe truely define it;* is either a deed or word, or thought, againſt ſome Divine Law. (r) *Lombard,* (ſ) *Aquinas, and other Schoolemen (as they are called) agree hereto.*

(p) Cõt. Fau. l. 22. c. 27. (q) Lib. de Paradiſ. c. 8. (r) Lib. 2. diſt. 35. (ſ) Th. 12. q. 71.

The Aſſumption is manifeſt in our firſt Argument, the firſt part of it.

ANSVV. This Argument toucheth not the queſtion: we grant his Concluſion; that particular Congregations may in & among themſelves exerciſe all Gods ordinances; and among the reſt this ordinance of combining themſelves in Synods, for the deciſion of their controverſies. This may be ſayd as well to be *in & among themſelves*, as the uſe of Synods for counſell, which my oppoſites allow for an ordinance of God. And as particular Churches may refuſe the counſell of Synods if it be unlawfull: ſo ought they to diſobey the ſentences and decrees of Synods, if they determine any thing contrary to the word of God.

His Propoſition being ſo manifeſt, it was needles to bring proof for it. But the definition of ſinne which he brings needleſly, is inſufficient: becauſe it comprehends not all ſinne under it. There is an originall corruption and depravation of na-

nature, which is Sinne, considered distinctly apart, beside thoughts, words or deeds. The Law requireth integrity of nature, and all disconformity with that Law is sinne, though not yet come so farre as thoughts. *Deut.6. with* 1.*Iohn.* 3.4. The saying of *Augustine* is to be taken rather for a distribution, then for a definition: and for a distribution, not simply of Sinne, but onely of Actuall sinnes, as they are either thoughts, words, or deeds. *Ambrose* is ill joyned with Austine, seeing in the place alledged he hath not the same, but another more large definition, containing under it Originall sinne also, when he sayth, (t) *What is sinne but a prævarication against the Law of God? &c.* This prævarication is as well in the nature and disposition of man, as in actuall sinnes. The judgement of *Aquinas*, and such Popish Schoolemen is not to be much esteemed in this poynt, while they teach that originall corruption in those that are baptised & justifyed is not properly any sinne at all, & therefore are rejected herein of all Orthodox Divines.

(t) Tom.4. lib. de Paradiso, c.8.

ARGVM. VI. *If the Apostle gave commandement unto the Eldership of Ephesus, for the whole administration of all Ordinances in that Church: Then may the Eldership of every particular Congregation administer among themselves all Gods ordinances. But the first is true: Therefore the second.*

The Major is proved two wayes. 1. *By Scripture, Act.20.vers.17.28.* 2. *By the testimony of the learned Whitaker, &c.*

The Minor is undenyable. For as Mr *Brightman sayth, there was one forme &c.*

ANSVV. I. Mr Canne here againe wanders from the question, & goes about to prove that which I never denyed, viz. *that the Eldership of every particular Church may administer all Gods ordinances among themselves.* Even those solemne acts of communion with other Churches both in things spirituall and corporall, being the ordinances of God, are to be performed by the direction of the Eldership. This hinders not but that any Eldership or Church it self, being found in errour or other unfaithfull dealing, may be subject to the censure of many Churches united in their Synods.

II. If it belong to the Eldership of every particular Church to administer all Gods ordinances; then how can the ordinances of God be duely administred in that Church of the Brownists whereof Mr Canne is Bishop alone; where there is no Eldership; where there is neither teaching nor ruling Elder beside himself? Seeing there is no Ruler in his owne Company but himself, & he denyes all other rule over him by Synods, doth he not make himself a kinde of Ecclesiasticall *Monarch* or sole Governour of the Separation?

III. Mr Canne doth here againe bewray his notorious ignorance of Logick, whereof he professeth so great skill, in the framing of so many Syllogismes, and yet like the children that know not the right hand from the left, cannot discerne betwixt the *Major* and the *Minor* of his Syllogismes. This appeareth here, when he calles that his *Major*, which he proves by *Act.*20.17.28. and by the testimony of D. Whitaker, viz. that *the Apostle gave commandement unto the Eldership of Ephesus, &c.* which is his Assumption, or *Minor*: and againe by calling that his *Minor* for which he cites Mr Brightman and other treatises, which serve to prove one forme of Church-government, common to all Churches; as any Logician that lookes upon

upon his Argument may easily discerne. When he propounded *Simple* or *Categoricall* Syllogismes, then was he not so deceyved in his guessing at a *Major* or *Minor*. But so oft as he useth any *Hypotheticall* Syllogisme, so oft he is as a man wandring in a wood or wildernes. And the reason hereof seemes to be this: whereas in a Hypotheticall Syllogisme, the *Antecedent* of the *Major* is assumed usually in the *Minor*, and that which is but a part of the *Major* comes to be the whole *Minor*, he mistaking a part for the whole, doth therefore call that which is onely the *Antecedent* of the *Major*, by the name of the whole *Major Proposition*, when as indeed it is the whole *Minor Proposition*, and so to be called. Had not W. Best bene a *Simplician*, as the Browniſt noted him to be, he would never have placed his confidence in the skill of this simple Logician, nor rested under the shadow of his Syllogismes.

ARGVM. VII. (v) *Such Offices and callings, without which the Church of God is complete, and perfect, for Government, are superfluous and humane. But the Church of God may be complete, and perfect, for Government, without Classicall and Synodicall Offices and callings. Therefore these Offices and callings are superfluous & humane.*

(v) Churc. plea, p. 72.

This Argument the Protestants have used against the Pope: & the Reformists against Bishops, Arch-Bishops, Chancellours, &c. Now the same is every-way as firme & good, against Synods and Classes; for without them, the Church of God, is fully brought to complete perfection and unity. D. Fulke (x) *confidently affirmeth so much. That which D. Whitaker* (y) *writes of Generall Councills, is by Mr Parker* (z) *applyed (and rightly) unto particular Synods.* The Church of God *(sayth he)* can wel subsist without them, for she was sometimes without them: besides we are not bound by any speciall commandement of God to have them.

(x) Learn. Disc. Eccl. Gov. p. 10, 11.
(y) De Cõc. qu. 1. p. 22, 23.
(z) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. p. 133.

ANSVV. I. This Argument concludes nothing against us, neither toucheth it the Question. When did I ever speake of any Synodicall offices? And what are those Offices that here he intends? The members of Classes and Synods, are no other then the ordinary Officers or Deputies of particular Churches, considering together and determining so as they judge best for the edification of their flockes.

II. If he imagine or conceive that the Præsident which propoundeth matters in Synods, or the Scribe that recordeth them, be distinct Synodicall Officers; he might as well think, and we might as well say, that the Browniſts also had other distinct Ecclesiasticall Offices, besides Pastours, Teachers, or Elders, namely Præsidents and Scribes; because heretofore in the dayes of Mr Iohnson and Mr Ainsworth, they with their Elders did by course propoũd matters in their Church, & had also a Scribe to write downe their speciall businesses: & now in Mr Cannes time, when they have no Eldership, if he alone propound matters and keep record of them in writing, it may then be sayd that he hath two or three Ecclesiasticall offices, as well as so many Mechanicall trades.

III. If propounding of matters as the Præsident, and writing them as the Scribe, doe constitute new offices; then many other members of the Browniſts Church, may be reputed for Ecclesiasticall Officers; for Præsidents and Scribes. For Mr Canne being now their onely Governour, if it fall out that any among

them shall make complaint against his doctrine or practise; then those members of the Church that shall propound the same to the Church, and moderate the action, or keep record thereof in writing, in behalf of the Church (he being unfit to doe it himself in his owne cause) must then be accounted new Officers, Præsidents & Scribes of the Church.

IV. That which he sayth of Classes and Synods, that *without them the Church of God is fully brought to complete perfection and unity*, comparing them to Lordly Prelates, Chancellours, &c. it is utterly false. He onely affirmes it, and no word of Scripture is alledged or so much as pretended for it. Is this to goe unto the Law and to the Testimony?

V. The testimonies of men which he alledgeth are falsifyed and perverted by him. *D. Fulk* shewes the sufficiency of those offices mentioned by him, viz. of *Doctours, Pastours, Governours, &c.* but he (a) shewes withall expressely how these exercise authority in Synods, as well as in the Elderships and particular Congregations. Though *D. Whitaker* and *Mr Parker* say, that the Church of God may subsist without Synods; yet he corrupts and falsifyes their testimony, when he makes them to say, the Church may *well* subsist without them. The Church of God may subsist and be a true Church, though it want some divine ordinances. Though they be not absolutely necessary to the *being* and subsistence of a Church, yet how needfull they are to the *well-being* of a Church, both those Authors doe shew and prove from divers grounds of Scripture, noted before. If the want of every ordinance of God should destroy the subsistence of a Church, thē that Company of Brownists under Mr Canne, wanting the ordinance of an Eldership so long a time, must have perished long agoe.

(a) Disc. of Eccl. Gov. p. 111, &c.

ARGVM. VIII. *Whatsoever Government cannot be found commanded in the written word of God; ought not to have any place in the Church of God. But the Government of Classes and Synods, over many particular Congregations, cannot be found commanded in the written word of God. Therefore it ought not to have any place in the house of God.*

The first part is grounded upon these Scriptures, Esa. 8. 20. Mat. 28. ult. &c. Likewise this is the judgement of many learned men, &c.

The second part is also as manifest; for if we once grant (as all learned men have granted) that the Churches of the Apostolick constitution, were independent bodies, and exercised Ecclesiasticall government in, and of themselves; then it must follow, that Classicall Assemblies, &c. have their rise *wholy, from the pleasure and will of man.*

ANSVV. The first part of this Argument, being of itself plaine enough, needed not such store of proof as Mr Canne brings for it. The Reader may observe his notable trifling, in alledging so many testimonies of Scripture, and testimonies of men (though some of them be carelesly misalledged) for proof of that which he had no reason to imagine that it would be denyed by me.

The second part of this Argument is most false, and he knowes it is denyed by me, and yet for proof of it he brings here neither word of God, nor word of man, no testimony, neither Divine nor humane. He sayth indeed, most untruely, that *all learned men have granted, that the Churches of Apostolick constitution, were independent bodies*; but he names not one learned man that so writes. The Scriptures both of the

the Old and New Testament, which shew a dependency of Churches in Ecclesiasticall judgements, have bene noted already, in those Arguments brought for the authority of Synods, together with the consent of learned men, such late opposites excepted as I my self first named as parties in this cause. All other learned Writers doe generally reject that independency which he dreames of.

ARGVM. IX. (b) *That Government which meerly tendeth unto the taking away from particular Congregations their due power, is unlawfull. But the Government of Classes & Synods (as they now are) doth meerly tend unto the taking away from particular Congregations their due power. Therefore that Government is unlawfull.* (b) Churches plea, p. 73.

The Major of this Argument may easily be proved by sundry places of Scripture; viz. 1. Thes. 4. 6. &c. the definition of justice, &c. the Etymologie or precise signification of the word, both in Greek and Latin. &c.

ANSVV. Here againe he playes the trifler, in alledging so many Scriptures & testimonies of men, to prove that which of itself is cleare enough, & more plaine then the proofes that he brings for it. In speciall that definition of justice which he brings, is not sufficiently confirmed by the Etymologies which he speakes of. The Greek Etymon noted out of Aristotle, is not so currant, but that some learned men refuse the same, and (c) derive the word from the Hebrew, from whence the principall Etymologies of that tongue are to be taken. And yet that Etymology which Aristotle brings of justice, is not with Mr Canne to demonstrate an entire definition of justice, but to shew in part one effect thereof; and Mr Canne overspeakes himself, when he sayth of the definition, *so much is imported in the Greek word.* The Latine Etymologie, which Mr Canne brings, viz. *jus a jure*, as he sets it downe in his margine, is more strange. It is likely his Authour whom he alledgeth, hath no such thing. If Mr Canne should owne it or approove of it, in such sort as it stands in his booke; it would thereby appeare that his skill in Grammar is like unto his skill in Logick. Who ever heard such an Etymology, that the Nominative should be derived of the Ablative? But admit there should be such a ridiculous Etymology, how doth he or how can he apply this to confirme his definition of justice? How doth this prove the trueth of his Major proposition? What is that which he saith is *imported* in this Etymology? And what is that *precise signification*, which he vainely talkes of, but doth not expresse? But let us now heare how he seekes to prove his *Minor*, which is most false. (c) Avenar. in præf. Lex. Ebr.

I. CAN. *The Minor is as manifest: 1. By* Mr Pagets *owne testimony in pag. 66. where he confesseth, that they have concluded among themselves in their Synods, that no particular Congregation without the leave and consent of the Classis,* shall proceed to the election of Ministers, excommunication of offendours, and the like, &c. ANSVV. 1. He doth manifestly change and alter my words; for when as I had sayd, that it had bene agreed in Synods, touching election of Ministers, excommunication, and the like, that the same shall not be proceeded in (d) *without advise of the Classis;* instead of this Mr Canne repeats it, *without leave and consent of the Classis.* Now according to the State of the Question betwixt us, there is difference betwixt doing a thing *without advise*, and *without leave*; men aske advise of many, of whom they aske no leave for doing a thing. (d) Answ. to W. B. p. 66.

II. Had I spoken more largely of the allow-

ance and consent of the Classes and Synods, yet would not my testimony have proved his Minor, viz. that *their government tends to the taking away from particular Churches their due power*: seeing the authority and help of Classes tends to the establishment of their due power, by directing and regulating the same, and so preventing the undue execution of their power. This order takes not away due power, but hinders and corrects onely the undue exercise of their power. Thus much is confessed by such as Mr Canne himself hereafter calles for to be his witnesses. Mr Baynes speaking of particular Congregations at Geneva, which doe not proceed in weighty matters without consent of other Churches meeting together by their Deputies, sayth, (e) *They have power of governing themselves, but for greater edification, voluntarily confederate, not to use nor exercise their power but with mutuall communication, one asking the counsell and consent of another in that common Presbytery*. And a little after he sayth, *Though they were intire Churches and had the power of Churches, yet they needed this support in the exercise of it, &c.* Mr Parker also, whom Mr Canne so oft alledgeth, and seemes to applaud as being of his opinion, is very expresse in this poynt, as I have noted before in answer to Mr D. He shewes that the government of Classes and Synods as they now are, doth not take away the due power of particular Congregations. Touching the Churches of the Villages in these Netherlands, with whom we are united in the same government, he sayth, (f) *The power of excommunication, ordination, and other jurisdiction,* illis illibata relinquitur, *is left pure unto them, saving onely that communion which ought to be among Churches: every Church useth the counsell and consent of her neighbours, as of the Classis or Presbytery in the city, which I suppose not to be unmeet even for the most perfect Churches.* He judged the freest and most perfect Churches to stand in need of this government, and that it was no empeachment of their due power. But Mr Canne labours to illustrate his assertion with some instances.

(e) Diocef. tryall. p. 21.

(f) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 23. p. 349.

I. CAN. *For instance; say the Classes and Synods will not permit, that a Congregation shall reject some convicted Heretick; then they must (if they will beleeve Mr Paget) let them alone in their communion, against Gods expresse commandement; Tit. 3. 10. and so obey men rather then God. Againe put case, some Churches doe want Ministers, yet notwithstanding, if the Classes and Synods will not give them leave, to choose any, except unfit and insufficient persons; then it seemes by this* Synodicall Canon, *they must take such, or remaine destitute still.* ANSVV. 1. If such strange cases, and unheard of in our times, should fall out, that then such oppression and tyranny, is not to be imputed unto the Classicall or Synodall order & government, but to the corruption & personall wickednes of such men as should be members of the Classis or Synod. Such accidentall evills, not springing from the nature of an ordinance, are no arguments to prove the unlawfulnes of an ordinance; when as the ordinance itself and in its owne nature serves for the preventing or remooving of such evills in particular Churches. 11. All the force of these objections, and all the feare of danger and inconvenience pretended by these instances comes as strongly, yea & much more heavily upon the heads of those that stand for a single, uncompounded policie, & would have all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction limited unto a particular Congregation: for example, put case that the greater part of a particular Congregation, and of the

the Elderſhip therein, will chooſe an offenſive and inſufficient Miniſter, or will not permit that an obſtinate and convicted Heretick among them ſhall be rejected; what ſhall the other part of the Church doe, which is oppreſſed and hindred from the due exerciſe of their power by the unrighteous proceeding of the greater part? What can follow here according to (g) the doctrine and practiſe of the Brownists, but ſeparation, & diſſipation of the Church? But by the government of Synods, if particular Churches be guilty of errour, oppreſſion and tyranny, their errour is to be corrected by Claſſes; if Claſſes erre, Synods may correct them; and one Synod may be corrected by another greater. And ſo many great evills may be redreſſed, and ſcandals remooved. III. As for the rejection of Hereticks, commanded *Tit. 3. 10.* a principall meanes for the accompliſhment thereof, is the help of Claſſes and Synods, by their diſcerning, convincing and judging of them. If that help ſhould faile, and thoſe that have authority ſhould neglect or refuſe to doe their duety herein; the godly after teſtifying againſt evill, are to tolerate that which they cannot amend: even as the Phariſees and Sadducees, convicted Hereticks, were tolerated by the godly, that remained in the Church without ſeparation. Laſtly, ſuppoſe that the power of particular Churches had bene in ſome ſort weakned, and not ſtrengthned by the government of Claſſes and Synods, as they now are; yet is it a groſſe falſhood, when he aſſumeth, or rather lavilhly preſumeth, that their government tends *merely*, or onely, to the taking away of the Churches due power; as though there were no other fruit or benefit by them. This he ſhall never prove.

(g) H. Ainſ. Animadv. p. 39. Cõm. of Saints, c. 23. p. 470. 471.

The ſecond proof of his Minor is taken from the practiſe of the Claſſis. W. Beſt is (h) there brought in complaining of the authority which they take over us and our Elderſhip too: *yea in truth* (ſayth he) *ſo much authority as any Lord can doe over his ſervant, &c.* But this is a ſhameles and impudent falſhood, without trueth; for no Lords ſuffer their ſervants to ſit with them in judgement, and to have a voyce for determining matters as well as themſelves; ſo as the Elders or Deputies of every Church are allowed in the Claſſis. Beſide other manifeſt differences, obſerve the unbounded and unmeaſurable ſlander, in his ſpeaking not onely of that authority which Lords doe take, but of that which *any Lord can* doe over his ſervant. For what is it which the worſt Lord cannot doe to his ſervant?

(h) Church. plea. p. 74.

That inſufficient reaſon which he brings for the declaration of this authority, may as well and more truely, in his words be applyed unto the Democracy of the Browniſts: for *ſo long as any member among them doth what that* imperious company *will have him doe, he is left alone; but if he meddle with things againſt the others liking, he is immediately commanded to ceaſe, and ſo muſt not proceed further.* Yea that Democraticall judicatory is farre more ſevere and ready to cenſure thoſe that reſiſt them, then is any Claſſis in theſe lands. Had any member of them ſo behaved himſelf againſt them, as W. Be. hath done to the Claſſis in this ſcandalous and reproachfull writing againſt them, as well as againſt me, he had bene long ſince delivered unto Satan: he could not have exſpected ſuch lenity and patience from them, as the Claſſis hath uſed towards this W. Be.

My anſwer unto a writing, touching *an action joyntly concluded* by them, as he

ſaith, viz. that *it did not belong unto them*; is deceitfully and imperfectly ſet downe. The matter being ſuch as had bene already brought unto the Claſſis, and there judged and decided againſt them: there was no reaſon that it ſhould be brought back to an inferiour judicatory; being ſuch as were parties alſo; being ſuch parties alſo as had bene already cenſured about that controverſy. And ſee the dawbing between Mr Canne and W.B. The concluſion ſpoken of, was not the concluſion of the Congregation; and Mr Canne himſelf allowes not a Conſiſtory to make any ſuch concluſions without the Congregation; and by his profeſſion, *it doth not belong* unto a Conſiſtory; and yet he helps W.B. to exclaime for that, wherein he himſelf is of another minde.

Touching the words of the Prophet, abuſed and miſapplyed by them to frame their complaint, *Woe unto us, we are ſpoyled, Ier.4.13.* I anſwer: 1. The liberty of appeales unto Claſſes and Synods, is that which preſerveth a Church and the members thereof from being ſpoyled by any faction. And by their help, we enjoy our liberty and peace; and are eſtabliſhed, and furniſhed with ſuch Miniſters, as agree with us in the trueth, and are endued with ſuch gifts as are meet for our edification. 2. On the contrary, for want of combination with Claſſes, *Mr Can.* may juſtly take up the complaint, *Woe unto us we are ſpoyled:* Since his comming unto them (beſide former diſſipations) their Church is rent in the midſt by incurable contentions, their people ſcattered, he himſelf depoſed, and rejected by the Elders & people; & they mutually one half abandoning another, & avoyding one anothers companies as excommunicates. Loe here a Spoyle.

ARGVM. X. *It is a ſinne againſt God, to adde any thing, to that forme and manner of ordering Churches, which Chriſt our heavenly Prophet, hath ſet forth unto us in the New Teſtament. To ſubject particular Congregations, under any other Eccleſiaſticall authoritie, out of themſelves, is to adde unto that forme and manner of ordering Churches, which &c. Therefore it is a ſinne to doe it.*

The Propoſition cannot be excepted againſt; for the Scriptures herein are evident, Deut. 4. 2. &c. Many learned men, &c.

The Aſſumption cannot for ſhame be denyed; onely becauſe the weight of the controverſy leaneth upon it, I will ſpeak further of it in the next Section.

ANSVV. For the Propoſition, 1. If it be well underſtood, I doe willingly grant it: And Mr Canne doth againe trifle, in alledging ſo many Scriptures, Ancient fathers, and other later Writers for the proof thereof. 11. Both the Scriptures and other Writers alledged by him, doe as well condemne ſuch as take from the word of God, as thoſe that adde unto it. And therefore they ſerve to reprove Mr Can. that detracts from it by denying the authority of Synods, taught in the forementioned Scriptures, both of the Old and New Teſtament. The Kings coyne is adulterate, as well by clipping and diminiſhing the ſame, as otherwiſe. This crime are they guilty of, that clip the authority of Synods. 111. The Fathers here mentioned doe give expreſſe teſtimony for Synods by ſpeciall & particular allowance of them, and therefore they are doubly abuſed, being thus alledged againſt their meaning.

For the Aſſumption, he incurreth a threefold ſhame. 1. It is a bold and ſhame-

ſhameles aſſertion for him to ſay, it *cannot for ſhame be denyed*; when as it is evidently falſe, and generally denyed by the moſt godly and learned in all ages. II. Another ſhame it is, that though he here confeſſe, *the weight of the controverſy leaneth upō it*; yet here he brings nothing at all for the confirmation thereof. This is his manner: where no need of proof is, there he idlie abounds with Scriptures, Fathers, and other Writers; where the poynt of difference is, on which the weight of the controverſy leaneth, there he leaves his Aſſumptions naked and without proof. III. It is a further ſhame, to put us off to the next Section, and to tell us he will there *ſpeak further of it*, where he onely alledgeth the teſtimonies of men. Is this anſwerable to the profeſſion of the Browniſts, that boaſt ſo much, *To the Law, and to the Teſtimony?*

HAving thus examined his Arguments, which he hath honoured with the ornaments of his Art, by propounding them in Syllogiſticall formes; we will now proceed to conſider another ſort of his Reaſons, to which he doth not vouchſafe ſo much reſpect, but propounds them more careleſly and nakedly, without ſuch complete Logicall attire. Of theſe he ſayth, *There are yet other reaſons to proove our Aſſertion; the which I will here lay downe more briefly.*

REAS. I. (i) *If every Elderſhip have a like & equall power, as Hierome, Cyprian, Bucer and others affirme; then may not the Officers of one Congregation, ſeeke by authority to ſuppreſſe the acts and decrees concluded in another.* (i) Church. plea, p. 75.

ANSVV. I. The conſequeuce of this reaſon is denyed by us. Though every Elderſhip be of equall power, yet the Miniſters and Elders of one Congregation, being joyned together in a Claſſis or Synod with the Deputies of many Churches, theſe may lawfully ſeek by their joynt authority, to ſuppreſſe any unlawfull acts or decrees of another Congregation. The reaſon is, becauſe as D. Whitaker (k) reaſoneth from Matt. 18. 20. and Mr Parker (l) alledgeth againe from him, *Vis unita fortior, Power combined is the ſtronger.* The concurrence of power from many Churches is the ground of Synodall and Claſſicall authority over particular Churches, though otherwiſe in themſelves conſidered apart they be all equall. II. Note here againe the trifling and ſhifting of *Mr Canne*. To prove the equality of Elderſhips, he alledgeth the teſtimonies of *Hierome, Cyprian, Bucer, and others*: though I had before granted it, and ſhewed that in the Claſſis our Elderſhip had (m) *the ſame liberty and power in giving our voyces equally* with others, and that our Elders (n) *have exerciſed as much authority as any member of the Claſſis, by giving their voyces for deciding, judging and determining any controverſy, &c.* yet needleſly he brings divers Writers for proof of this confeſſed and practiſed trueth; and for the confirmation of his moſt falſe conſequence he offers not to bring any proof at all, from any word of God or man.

(k) De Cōc. qu. 4. c. 3.
(l) Pol. Eec. l. 3. c. 13. § 4.
(m) Anſw. to W. B p. 86.
(n) Ibid. p. 90.

REAS. II. *It is againſt ſence, that a Miniſter ſhould undertake the care of more Churches then one onely: who reads in Scripture of a ſteward over many families, a ſheepheard over divers flockes, &c.* Nature hath ordained (ſaith (o) *Ariſtotle*) one unto one. (o) Lib. 1. c. 2.

ANSVV. I. We read in Scripture of Jaacob that was a ſhepherd over divers flockes, both of his owne and of Labans. *Gen.* 30. 36, 40. II. We read in Scripture of the Apoſtles that were ſtewards and ſhepherds over divers flockes, having the

the care of all Churches, 1.Cor.4.1. *with* 2.Cor.11.28. Ioh.20. 15,16. Mr Canne ought at leaſt to have excepted extraordinary Shepherds. III. Though ordinary Paſtours or Miniſters have the peculiar and proper charge of no more then one flock; yet in regard of a common and joynt care of many Churches combined in Claſſes and Synods, we read in Scripture that the Elders and Shepherds of the Church in Ieruſalem did undertake the care, and exerciſe with others authority in judging the cauſe of the Church of Antioch. It is againſt ſenſe, againſt nature, againſt Scripture, but that the members of the body ſhould have *care one for another.* 1.Cor.12.25. *&c.* IV. The uſe of Claſſes and Synods for counſell and admonition is allowed by my oppoſites, and yet the care and labour therein, for travelling to meet in ſuch aſſemblies, for deliberation, for diſputing, for convincing ſuch as they admoniſh, and their counſell given unto Churches for the rejecting of Hereticks and other obſtinate offendours, more or leſſe, is as great in effect as if they ſhould give definitive ſentence therein. As little diſtraction ariſeth from one work as from the other. To counſell a Church to excommunicate a ſinner, is as great a burden and labour for a Synod, as if they ſhould pronounce the ſentence themſelves. V. It doth leaſt of all become Mr *Canne* to plead and reaſon on this manner. If *nature have ordained one to one*, as he argueth out of Ariſtotle (though in his quotation he forgat to tell where) then muſt Mr Canne be a man againſt nature, above many other, in tranſgreſſing the law and ordinance of nature. How durſt he take the Paſtorall charge of a Church upon him, and this alone without aſſiſtance of an Elderſhip, and yet in the meane time undertake the care and charge of divers other trades, as of a Printers work-houſe in one place, of a *Brandery* or Aqua vitæ ſhop in another place, and ſpecially of an Alchymiſts laboratory in another place? Is this paragon of the Separation a fit man to be an Advocate or Patron of the Churches, to write a booke and intitle it *the Churches plea*, whereas if his example were followed, it would bring confuſion upon all Churches and on all the Miniſters thereof? What Pluraliſt or Non-reſident is there that will not thinke he hath ſome colour, to juſtify himſelf from this practiſe of Mr Canne?

REAS. III. *Is it a like thing, that the Claſſicall power, ſhould be of Gods approving, and yet he never mention it in his word? This argument the Hierarchy uſe againſt Popiſh Offices; and the Reformiſts againſt theirs. Now let the diſcreet Reader judge, if it proove not the point in hand as well. Here I may not omit Zwinglius his ſpeech, ſpeaking of Synods:*

(p) Zwingl. Art.8.expl. „ (p) Wee willingly beleeve (*ſayth hee*) that you are a repreſentative Church; for „ a true Church you are not. But I pray you ſhew us, whence you fetch this name? „ Who hath given you this name? who hath given you power to make Canons, „ impoſe things on mens ſhoulders, grieve their conſciences, &c.

ANSVV. I. This Reaſon is in ſubſtance the ſame with his fift Argument before, and therefore idly repeated. The grounds of Claſſicall power are ſhewed (q) before from the Scriptures, and the cavills of Mr Canne againſt the ſame, refuted.

(q) Chap.2. & 3. & 4.

II. Note his errour of ſpeech in diſtinguiſhing the Hierarchy from Popiſh Offices, by oppoſing them one againſt the other; whereas according to the common acception of the word, the Hierarchy doth conſiſt in the Popiſh offices; and the cor-

corruption of offices which he intends, is but a fragment thereof, and therefore ought not to carry the name rather then the whole, when both are ſpoken of together. Otherwiſe in proper ſpeech, the true Hierarchy imports the lawfull offices and government, preſcribed in the Scriptures. III. That which he alledgeth out of Zwinglius touching a *repreſentative Church*, is to be underſtood of the Romiſh Church, and of the Popiſh government; for againſt them did Zwinglius then write: and againſt them there was juſt cauſe to complaine ſo as he did. IV. If any thinke that by *repreſentative Churches* he meant all Synods whatſoever, that exerciſe Eccleſiaſticall authority in the judging of cauſes; then againſt the teſtimony of Zwinglius we oppoſe the teſtimony of all ages, and of the learned Writers therein, old and new, Papiſts and Proteſtants, that generally are againſt him. Mr Parker (r) ſayth well, *All ages have called the* Synod *a repreſentative Church*: & beſide many other witneſſes he alledgeth D. Whitaker, arguing thus againſt the Papiſts, (ſ) *The Church is repreſented in the* Synod; *therefore if the Church be above Peter, then is the* Synod *alſo.* Mr Parker argues further, *Except the* Synod *did conſiſt of the Deputies of Churches, Synods could not repreſent the Churches*: and having there brought many teſtimonies of Scripture to ſhew the power of Churches in ſending their Deputies or Delegates, he concludes in the words of D. Whitaker, (t) *Whoſoever is ſent of the Church he repreſents the perſon of the Church.* But touching the judgment of Zwinglius, more hereafter, when he is againe alledged by Mr Canne.

(r) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 26. p. 368, 369.
(ſ) De Cõc. qu. 5. c. 3. p. 169.
(t) Qu. 3. c. 3. p. 103.

REAS. IV. (v) *Whoſoever ſhall deny our aforeſayd aſſertion, muſt of neceſſity hold, two diſtinct formes of Church-government; one wherein particular Congregations doe in, and of themſelves, exerciſe all Gods ordinances; the other where they ſtand under another Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves. Now to hold this, is directly all one, as to hold two wayes to heaven; diſtinct and oppoſite in themſelves, which is very ſcandalous in Religion, and that which cannot ſtand with truth.*

(v) Church. plea, p. 76.

ANSVV. I. Whatſoever Mr Canne here affirmeth, is but his bare aſſertion, without Scripture or other proof to confirme his reaſon. But Mr Can. is not yet come to ſuch credit with us, that his *ipſe dixit*, his bare word may goe for currant. II. It is falſe which he ſayth of holding *two diſtinct formes of Church-government, &c.* The particular Congregations here in theſe Reformed Churches doe in, and of themſelves, exerciſe all Gods ordinances, and yet withall ſtand under another Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves; Synodall authority being one of Gods ordinances. Though in regard of the locall and perſonall preſence of all the members of the Church, this authority is exerciſed out of themſelves: yet in regard of their confederation and combination with neighbour Churches, and in regard of their Deputies, Miniſters, and Elders or others that have place and ſuffrage in theſe Synods, this authority is exerciſed in and of themſelves. And though here be another act of authority, yet is there but one diſtinct forme of government. III. It is as falſe which he ſayth of holding *two wayes to heaven*: and this not onely in reſpect of theſe Reformed Churches among themſelves, having the ſame government, both by Elderſhips at home, and by Synods abroad; but alſo in reſpect of divers Churches, having different formes of government. The Church of England and of theſe Countries, though they have a different order of Church-

government, yet holding together the ſame fundamentall trueths of the Goſpell, they both doe hold but one way to heaven, and ſo doe both mutually acknowledge one another to be in that way. IV. This company of Brownifts whereof Mr Canne is the ſole Governour, was formerly governed by an Elderſhip, and now ſince their diviſion they have no Elderſhip to rule them. Whether it be becauſe they thinke they have none among them fit to be Elders; or whether they doe wilfully refuſe ſuch as they cannot deny to be fit; or whether there be any other cauſe, I leave it to themſelves. Alwayes this we know that there be ſome Churches in remote countries, that want the benefit of Claſſicall government, becauſe there be no other neighbour Churches neere unto them, with whom they may combine themſelves for their mutuall guidance and edification. But now if the want of an Elderſhip among the Brownifts, ſuch as they once had, doe not warrant us to ſay, that they hold two diſtinct formes of Church-government to be lawfull, one with an Elderſhip, another without an Elderſhip; & conſequently that they hold two wayes unto heaven: then much leſſe can the want of a Synod in reſpect of the different conſideration of the times, places, occaſions and opportunities of ſeverall Churches, be any warrant for Mr Canne to object unto us two formes of government, or two wayes to heaven, &c.

(x) Whit. Cont. 4. qu. 4. Chamier. l. 6. cõject. 2.

REAS. V. *Let it be obſerved, that for this reaſon (among others) the Learned* (x) *ſay, the Pope is Antichriſt: viz. becauſe he will have men to appeale from their owne Churches unto him; and to ſtand under his ſentence and decree. And doe not the Claſſicall aſſemblies and Synods, take upon them an authority much like to it, in ſubjecting many Congregations to them, requiring appeales to be made to them, and that the* Judicatory *(as Mr Pagets* * *phraſe is) belongeth to them; as if their power were above all Churches.*

* In his Letter &c.

ANSVV. I. Let it be obſerved how Mr Canne ſpeaking here againſt appeales made unto Claſſes and Synods, brings no Scripture, no word of God to condemne them, but onely the teſtimonies of men: he needed not to have reſerved hereafter a peculiar Section onely for humane teſtimonies, when he uſes them ſo oft before. II. Let it be obſerved how notably he abuſeth even theſe teſtimonies alſo againſt the meaning of his Authors. D. Whitaker (y) pleads for appeales, as being both *of divine and naturall right*. Chamier (whom Mr Canne doth miſquote, without the title of the book alledged) ſayth, that appeales (z) *are of common equity: and truely without them the Church could hardly or not at all ſubſiſt*; ſpeaking of appeales unto Synods. That which learned and orthodox Writers blame in appeales made unto the Pope, is this, that they are made unto one man, and not unto a Synod; aſſcribing unto him infallibility of judgement; giving him power over Churches that are not combined with the Church of Rome: and in ſpeciall for this, that the Pope allowes no appeales to be made from him unto a Synod: This is the Antichriſtian pride that they condemne in the Pope. And herein the Church of the Brownifts doth plainly reſemble the Pope; ſeeing their Congregation alſo, their Democraticall judicatory allowes no appeale to be made from them unto Claſſes or Synods, unto any Eccleſiaſticall judges beſides themſelves. Theſe are two of the moſt monſtrous propoſitions of the Papiſts, touching the Popes authority, viz. that (a) *the Pope is above a Generall Synod, and acknowledgeth*

(y) DePont. Rom. qu. 4. p. 470.

(z) Panſtrat. Catho. tom. 2. l. 13. c. 17

(a) Bellarm. de Conc. l. 2. c. 17. & 18.

no

no judgment on earth above him: and againe, that *the Pope cannot commit the coactive judgement over him, neither unto a Synod, nor unto any man, but onely the discretive:* & this discretive judgement they expound to be such a kinde of arbitrement, as doth not binde him further then it pleaseth him. Now so farre as concernes Ecclesiasticall judgement, the Brownists, and the maintainers of the single uncompounded policie, doe likewise hold that there is no judgement on earth above their particular Congregation; and that they may not commit any controversy of theirs unto the censure and decision of any Synod. What stronger reason could Mr C. have alledged against himself, to shew their unlawfull government, then this their denyall of appeales? 111. Let it be observed how foolishly Mr Canne cavills at my speech touching Classicall assemblies and Synods, when he relates it thus, *the judicatory (as Mr Pagets phrase is) belongeth unto them:* for this relation is false; that was not my phrase; but I sayd *the judicature* did belong unto them. It was the simplicity of his informer, or of some ignorant scribe that put *judicatory* for *judicature*, as may appeare by the writing I made, which is yet to be seene. Note Mr C. his rashnes in receyving such things.

Reas. VI. *What more meet and reasonable, then that every mans case be there heard and determined, where the fault was committed? So sayth* (b) *Cyprian*, It is not fit that they over whom the Holy Ghost hath made us overseers, should goe too & fro. *He speaketh of carying matters away from their owne Church unto others.* (b) Cypr. lib. 1. Epist. 3.

Answv. 1. Though it be meet and reasonable that every mans cause be first there heard, where the fault was committed; yet is it as reasonable, that if either an unjust sentence be there given, the innocent may in the second place have liberty of appeale from their oppressours; or if the case be difficult and weighty, that the matter be at first brought unto Classicall assemblies, according to the order of Reformed Churches. 11. For confirmation of this reason he brings no word of God, but onely the testimonie of Cyprian, which also according to his manner, he doth most palpably abuse. For Cyprian doth not simply blame those that appealed unto Synods, but onely such as did inordinately run too and fro, such as were not content with the Synods in Africa, but sayled over the sea unto the Church of Rome. Of such he there speakes. And even in the same Epistle Cyprian shewes both the use of Synods allowed in the Churches of Africa, and the authority of Synods in censuring offendours. He there gives (c) instances of *Privatus*, condemned in an assembly of 99 Bishops, of *Fœlix*, of *Iovinus & Maximus*, excluded from the communion of the Church by a Synod, of *Repostus* also, censured in like manner. Their Synods were not onely for counsell, but exercised a jurisdiction Ecclesiasticall. And as they exercised the power of the keyes in binding obstinate sinners, so also in loosing and absolving those that repented, as appeares in (d) another Epistle going immediately before this alledged, and written by the Synod itself. In the inscription of that Epistle are prefixed the names of *Cyprian, Liberalis, Caldonius, Nicomedes, and Cæcilius, &c.* as being speciall members of that Synod, and writing joyntly together that Synodicall Epistle. (e) Goulartius also in his annotations thereon, observeth that *these Synods were kept to this end that the purity of doctrine and the discipline of the Church might be preserved entire; and that* (c) Lib. 1. e. 3. § 11, 12. (d) Lib. 1. Ep. 2. § 2. (e) Ibid. n. 6.

the disturbers thereof might be excluded from their communion. And in many other places Cyprian is so pregnant in this poynt, that whosoever shall alledge him against the authority of Synods, must either be a very ignorant reader of Cyprian, or els a wilfull abuser of him.

REAS. VII. *Note the effect, if it should be otherwise; which is that every particular Congregation must hence necessarily loose her owne proper right in government, & so of a Mistres become a servant: instead of being superiour, wilfully vassall and enslave herself, which thing is contrary to Gods will revealed in his word. Gal.* 5.1. 1.*Cor.* 7.23. 2.*Tim.* 1.13. *Heb.*4.14. *Rev.*2.25.

ANSVV. I. This reason is the same for substance with his ninth Argument before; and therefore it is here idly repeated. II. The vassallage and slavery which he argues from Classicall government, is upon a false consequence. The liberty of innocent persons oppressed by wrong judgment in a particular Church, is to appeale unto Classes and Synods. The Democraticall government that denyes this liberty of appeale, is no gracious mistresse, but a Tyrannicall virago, resembling the Romish Lady, that by denying appeales from the Pope keeps many in bondage. III. The Scriptures cited by him are all perverted and misapplyed: for what force of consequence is in these reasonings? viz. *Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, &c. Gal.*5.1. therefore stand fast against appeales from particular Congregations. *Be not the servants of men:* 1.*Cor.* 7.23. therefore be subject to no Ecclesiasticall government, save onely to the Democracie of a particular Church. *Hold fast the forme of sound words, &c.* 2.*Tim.* 1.13. therefore hold fast the independencie of Churches. *Let us hold fast our profession: Heb.*4.14. therefore hold fast the single uncompounded policie. *Hold fast that which ye have already, &c. Rev.* 2.25. therefore hold this fast, that Classes and Synods are onely for counsell, and not for authority to censure and judge. What unsound inferences and applications of Scripture be these? Mr Canne in his 9th Argument before, (f) alledged also, 1.*Thes.*4.6. 3.*Ioh.*9. *Prov.*22.28. *Deut*, 19.14. together with *Gal.* 5.1. Mr Dav. also to like purpose (g) alledgeth some of these places, to wit, *Prov.*22.28. *Gal.*5.1.3. *Ioh.*9. But they prove the Question as little as the other: for how vaine are these consequences? *Thou shalt not remove the ancient bounds; Prov.* 22.28. therefore all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction is limited to a particular Congregation, and he removes the ancient bounds that allowes the authority of Synods. Or, *Diotrephes loved the preheminence;* 3.*Ioh.* 9. therefore Classes and Synods have no jurisdiction or power to judge and determine the matters of a particular Congregation. What weight is there in such reasonings as these?

(f) Churches plea.p. 73.

(g) Apol. reply.p.237.

REAS. VIII. *Seeing the Apostles, whersoever they constituted any Church, with doctrine, immediately established in it* (h) *Ecclesiasticall government; for without this (as D. Ames* (i) *sayth)* there could have bene no coupling of the parts and members together. *It must needs follow, that the primitive Churches were* independent bodies, and stood not under any other Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves. *Now how Mr Paget will be able to prove a change of this government, I doe not yet see: especially, considering that the Learned (as I shewed before) doe hold that there is but* one certaine, necessary & perpetuall forme, & manner of ordering Churches, &c.

(h) Pol.Ecc. l.1.p.20.

(i) De Cõsc. l.4.c.24. p. 214.

ANSVV.

ANSVV. 1. The consequence propounded in this reason is false. Though the Apostles in the constitution of Churches, did immediately establish Ecclesiasticall government therein; yet must it not needes follow, that they were *independent bodies &c.* For proof of this consequence he brings nothing but his bare assertion, neither Scripture, nor testimony of any learned Writer. To prove an establishment of government in the primitive Churches at first, he idly and needlesly alledgeth Mr Parker, and D. Ames; to prove the perpetuity and unchangeablenes of that government, which needed no proof, he needlesly according to his manner, heapes up testimonies of Calvin, of P. Martyr, of D. Bilson, of the Churches of France, of the Low-countries, of Scotland, and of Papists also: but to help his weak, unsound consequence, that needed confirmation and support, there is no proof, nor shew of proof. 11. Though particular Churches in their severall assemblies be acknowledged to be distinct bodies, yet in regard of the entire and full communion of Saints, they are all members of one body: there is but *one body*, *Eph.* 4. 4. And those that are members of one body are not independent. The Scriptures that shew this unity and the dueties arising from thence are justly alledged and layd downe as the ground of combination and consociation of Churches. And this foundation of Classicall communion being as ancient as the first constitution of Churches, it appeareth hereby that the right of this confederation of Churches was in them from the beginning, with liberty to use and exercise the same as occasion and opportunity should permit. *Mr Cartwright* being required to shew Scripture for the warrant of this practise of Churches, answereth, (k) The Scripture I prove it by is, that S[t] Paul when he teacheth that all the faithfull are members of one Mysticall body of Christ, which ought to have a mutuall care one of another; layd the foundations of this politie. For as in the body of one particular Church, every faithfull man compared with another in the same, is a member one of another: so in a more generall body of a whole Realme, every particular Church compared with other, is likewise a member of them. Therefore as nature teacheth my hand to help the disorder which is in another part of my body: so the Spirit of God out of his word, through a fellow-feeling teacheth one Church, to stretch out her hand, to put away as it can, the evill which it seeth approch unto another. And therefore when the Scripture willeth that one should admonish another, it is not onely a commandement to every singular man, towards his fellow: but also to one whole company, towards another societie. *Mr Parker* (l) alledgeth the same ground out of *Zepperus*, who from thence deriveth the authority of Classes and Synods, in censuring and judging the causes of many Churches, and citeth many such places of Scripture for proof thereof. 111. When the Church of Antioch brought her controversy unto the Synod at Ierusalem, there was no change of government. They had this right from the first, though then especially it were manifested unto all for the actuall exercise thereof, upon occasion of the dissention. 1v. It appeares that the primitive Churches at their first constitution by the Apostles, were not independent bodies, in a speciall respect more then any in our times; because they were then subject to the extraordinary government by

(k) T.C. 2. Rep. p 231. Rom. 12. 1. Cor. 12.

Rom. 15. 14 Heb. 3. 13.

(l) See before, p. 95. 96.

Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, who beſides that which they did in ordinary courſe of judgement with the Churches concurrence, as 1. Cor. 5. had alſo of themſelves extraordinary authority and power granted unto them over all Churches, for the correcting of the wicked therein, as appeareth, 1. Cor. 4. 21. 2. Cor. 10. 2, 3, 6, 8, 10. Act. 5. 9, 10. 3. Ioh. 10.

(m) Churc. plea, p. 77.

REAS. IX. (m) *By the titles given to all particular Congregations, it appeares evidently, that Eccleſiaſticall authority is (or at leaſt ought to be) in every one of them, diſtinctly, wholy, intirely; viz. a* Kingdome, *Matt. 3. 2. a* Family, *Eph. 2. 19. a* Body, 1. Cor. 12. 20. *a* Queene, *Pſal. 45. &c. For what more ſenceles, then to ſay, a Kingdome, or family, ſtanding under another Politicall, or Oeconomicall government out of themſelves; a body having all parts & members, & yet may neither receive in, nor put out without anothers leave and conſent; many ſuch abſurdities followeth Mr Pagets lately-deviſed Tenets.*

ANSVV. 1. That which ſeemes ſenſeles and abſurd unto the tranſcendent underſtanding of Mr Can. and W. Be. is notwithſtanding found reaſonable in the judgement of ſober men. As for Kings and their kingdomes, we ſee in the ſtory of the new Teſtament, that the three King-Herods, and the fourth King Agrippa, both they and their kingdomes did ſtand under another Politicall government, under the Romane Empire, under the authority of Cæſar to whom they payd tribute. *Mat. 2. & 14. & Act. 12. & 25. & 26. with Luk. 2. 1. Matt. 22. 21. Iohn. 19. 12, 15.* And in the old Teſtament, we read that Zedekias King of Judah ſtood under the Politicall government of the King of Babel. *Ierem. 27. 12. 2. Chron. 36. 13.* And other ſtories ſhew that this was no ſtrange thing. The Kings and Kingdomes of Bohemia and Hungary at this day ſtand under the command of the Emperour. As for families and their Oeconomicall government, in regard of that obedience which children owe to their parents, by vertue of the fift Commandement, *Honour thy father and thy mother, Exo. 20. 12.* inferiour families owe ſubjection unto ſuperiour. Thoſe families that deſcended from Adam for ſix or ſeven generations together, and thoſe families that deſcended of Noah, Shem, Arpacſhad, Shelah, and Eber, though in their habitations they were divided after the Flood, did yet owe ſubjection unto theſe fathers and grand-fathers, and in matters of greateſt moment and controverſy concerning their families, as about family-worſhip, mariages, and the like, they were bound to ſubmit unto their cenſure and determinations in the Lord; thoſe five Patriarkes being then all alive in thoſe corrupt times, after the confuſion of languages. *Gen. 11.* As for the bodies of men, it is not unreaſonable or abſurd to thinke that the members of any mans body ſhould not be cut off at his owne will, without the conſent and approbation of ſundry experienced and ſkillfull Chirurgeons, according to the order appoynted by the Governours of this City, and practiſed therein. II. Thoſe Scriptures alledged to ſhew *the titles given to particular Congregations*, doe not prove the matter intended. By the *kingdome of heaven, Matth. 3. 2.* is not underſtood ſimply a particular Congregation; but the abundance of grace revealed and exhibited either unto particular perſons, Congregations, or the whole Church of God throughout the world, &c. Thus the kingdome of heaven or the kingdome of God is in every ſeverall beleever, and they are all Kings: *Rom. 14. 17.*

Rev.

Rev. 1. 6. & now according to Mr Cannes reaſoning, not any one of them ſhould ſtand under any other ſpirituall government, under any Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves, becauſe they are kings themſelves, and have a ſpirituall kingdome within them. By the *houſhold of God*, *Epheſ.* 2. 19. may be underſtood the whole univerſall Church of God, as well as a particular Congregation; and ſo by the *one body*, 1. Cor. 12. 20. and ſo by the *Queene*: *Pſal.* 45. 9. And therefore theſe places prove nothing for the reſtraint and limitation of all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction unto a particular Congregation onely; which is the late-deviſed tenent of the Brownists.

Reas. X. *The acts of the Apoſtolique Churches proove directly our aſſertion: For it is without all contradiction, that they elected their owne Miniſters, excommunicated, offenders, ſent meſſengers, and performed all other* Church matters *among themſelves.*

Answv. This reaſon taken from the acts of the Apoſtolick Churches is for ſubſtance the ſame with the firſt, third, fourth, and ſixt Syllogiſticall arguments before, and there anſwered; and here by him idly repeated, to increaſe the number of his Reaſons.

Reas. XI. *Laſtly, let it be obſerved, that* Mr Paget *in this accordeth with the* (n) *Papiſts; for they ſay (as hee doth) that* particular Churches are not independent bodies, but ſtand under another Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves. *The which thing our Writers deny, and proove the contrary.* (n) Bellar. de Eccl. l. 5. c. 5.

Answv. 1. The accord of Papiſts is no ſufficient reaſon for refutation; ſeeing they accord with us in many poynts of religion, againſt Arrians, Anabaptiſts, Brownists, and others. 11. See the partiality of Mr Canne: in his eight Reaſon before, he alledgeth for himſelf how the Papiſts doe accord with him; *to this the Papiſts aſſent*, ſayth he; here in this place he alledgeth againſt me, their accord & aſſent with me; preſently after againe, in the ſame and following pages, he *doubts not but to make it manifeſt*, that the Papiſts are *with him*, &c. Thus when they accord with him it muſt ſerve for the confirmation of his reaſon: when they accord with me, it muſt ſtill ſerve for confirmation of his reaſon, and for the condemning of me. Whether it be their aſſent or diſſent, it is all one to him: he can ground his arguments upon one as well as the other. Such are his reaſonings. 111. Mark his falſe allegation of Bellarmine, de Eccl. l. 5. c. 5. when as there is no ſuch fift booke extant, written by Bellarmine. 1v. How farre we differ from the Papiſts, and Popiſh Hierarchy, in this controverſy about Synods, hath bene noted (o) at firſt, in the State of the Queſtion, and may be ſeene at large in manifold paſſages ſet downe before out of (p) *Iunius*, and (q) *D. Whitaker*, their diſputes againſt Bellarmine, and out of (r) *Mr Parker* his refutation of the Hierarchy in this particular; which to repeat, in a caſe ſo cleare, were to imitate Mr Canne in his needles and ſuperfluous quotations.

(o) Pag. 29. 30.
(p) P. 125.-132.
(q) P. 133.-141.
(r) P. 101.-104.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Allegations of Mr Canne examined.

AFter the former 21 Arguments against the authority of Synods, Mr Canne falles to flatter himself, & rejoyces in himself to thinke what the Reader will imagine when he sees his manifold Reasons. (a) *By this time I suppose* (saith he) *the indifferent Reader perceiveth, that the Scriptures, are every way for us, and against* Mr Paget, *in this controversy betwixt us. Now hee should doe well, seeing we dispute about a matter of faith, appertaining to life and salvation; to rest in them as the onely touchstone for triall of all truth.* But then further, to make way for his new troupes & legions of Humane Testimonies against me, and because this doth not well suit with his profession, that pretends so much warrant of Scripture, and to rely onely upon it; therefore he seeks to take occasion from my words, thereby to excuse his vaine ostentation in alledging so many Writers, and saith, *Notwithstanding considering he makes so much a doe, about the* multitude of learned and godly Ministers, being of the same judgement and practise with him; *(according as Festus knowing Paul to have appealed unto* Cæsar, *did reasonably resolve, saying,* Unto Cæsar shalt thou goe, *so) I am well contented to heare what reverend and judicious Authors doe say herein: And if* Mr Paget *will stand unto their Testimonies, I doubt not but to make it manifest, that (as the Scriptures so) they are also with us; &c.* Hereunto I answer, 1. In all my former Answer I have not alledged against them the testimony of any one Author: neither have I framed any argument drawne from their words. The words of my writing which he alledgeth, are onely a part of an answer unto a slanderous accusation both of me and the Classis, in a matter of fact, wherein I shew how unconscionably and without proof they wrong both me and *a multitude of learned and godly Ministers, being of the same judgement and practise.* I desire the Reader to looke upon the (b) place and to judge thereof. 11. Whereas he thereupon brings forth an Army of Papists and Lutheranes, Ancient fathers and later Writers, Conformists & Non-conformists, &c. though it be with lesse reason then Festus sent Paul to Cæsar, seeing I made no such appeale, as Paul did unto Cæsar; yet I am content to follow him, and to heare what his Authors doe say, and to shew both how idly and needlesly he alledgeth many of them, to prove that which is not denyed; and also how he perverts and falsifyes their meanings, alledging them for that which is contrary both to their words and practise.

(a) Churc. plea, p. 77.

(b) Answ. to W.B. p. 73.

The severall Bands of that Army, which Mr Canne mustereth against us, are these, as he reckoneth them, (c) *The Allegations of the Learned, which I purpose here to set downe, shall be taken,* 1. *From Papists.* 2. *Lutherians.* 3. *Calvinists.* 4. *English Conformists.* 5. *The Non-Conformists.* 6. *Ancient Writers: And lastly the Confession of Reformed Churches.*

(c) Churc. plea, p. 78.

SEC-

SECTION, I.

Touching the Teſtimonies of Papiſts.

HAving promiſed to produce the Teſtimonies of *Reverend and judicious Authors*, as he calles them, he brings in the Papiſts and drawes out the Popiſh band in the firſt place againſt me. When *Mr Spr.* once heretofore had propounded divers *Conſiderations* unto them of the Separation, and among other things the teſtimony and approbation given to the Church of England by ſundry learned men, as *Bucer, Martyr, Fagius, Alaſco, Knox, Calvine, Beza, &c.* Mr Ainſworth anſwers, (d) *Though you come againſt us with horſmen and charets; yet we will remember the name of the Lord our God, &c.* That which David ſpeakes of his refuge againſt the forces of the Heatheniſh Princes, *Pſal.* 20.7. he applyes againſt theſe Worthies, which were indeed *the horſemen and charets of Iſrael*: 2. *King.* 2.12. & 13. 14. But that might I much more juſtly apply unto Mr Canne, that alledgeth againſt me, and ſo unjuſtly, ſuch a company of Romaniſts, the horſmen and charets of Antichriſt, the Locuſts like horſes prepared unto the battell. *Rev.* 9.7.

(d) Counterp. p. 19.

And here firſt of all let it be conſidered what open wrong he doth unto the Papiſts, *Bellarmine*, the *Rhemiſts*, &c. in faining that they will not allow that government now, which they acknowledge to have bene uſed of old; while he ſaith, *Howſoever Romes-Champions will have none now to meddle with Church-government, but Prieſts, Biſhops, Prelates, &c. yet they doe acknowledge that in the primitive Church, according to the precept of Chriſt, in Mat.* 18. *offenders, after the firſt and ſecond admonition, were brought to the whole Congregation, &c.* This which he faineth to be granted by them, touching a diverſity of Government in reſpect of times, cannot be juſtly affirmed. For *Bellarmine* in the place (e) alledged by him, pleads for the ſame Government to be uſed now, which he ſhewes to have bene ordained and confirmed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and to that end he alledgeth 8 or 9 places of Scripture out of the new Teſtament, as grounds of the ſame Government. And in the (f) Chapter following he laboureth to prove that the ſame Government hath bene ſtill retained and practiſed ever ſince, from the firſt age of the primitive Church unto this preſent. The *Rhemiſts* alſo (g) derive the government which they now ſtand for, from the inſtitution of Chriſt, and practiſe of the primitive Church. And therefore it is untrue which he ſayth, viz. that the Papiſts acknowledge a difference betwixt the government inſtituted at the firſt, and that which is now maintained by them. To prove this generall aſſertion he alledgeth a particular teſtimony of *Scultingius*. But that which is ſayd of one, cannot be aſſcribed unto all in ſuch generall termes as he hath done, ſaying of Romes-Champions, *they doe acknowledge* that which Scultingius ſayth, whereas we ſee that the chief of them avouch the contrary.

(e) De Verbo Dei, l. 3. c. 5.

(f) Ibid. c. 5

(g) Rhem. on Mat. 18. 17. & 1. Cor. 5.

This teſtimony of *Scultingius*, as it is abſurdly fathered upon the Papiſts in generall; ſo it is unjuſtly applyed againſt us. Though in the primitive Church offenders being impenitent were *excommunicated with conſent and approbation of all, by the Miniſter*; and though this teſtify the power of the Church, for which cauſe it

is alledged by Mr Parker (from whom it seemes Mr Canne hath taken this testimony at second hand, together with his observation upon it, touching the force of trueth in a Papist) yet this proves not that the Church was not subject to the censure of a superiour judicatory, if they did abuse their power. Mr Parker drawes no such consequence from this testimony, to exclude the authority of Synods. There is nothing sayd by Scultingius here, but it hath alwayes bene observed in our Church. Offenders are not excommunicated, as being impenitent, before they have bene denounced (as this Authors phrase is) or complained of by giving notice of their estate unto the whole Church; before whom also the sentence of excommunication is pronounced: and this our manner was allowed by Mr Park. being sometime one of us, as I shewed (h) before.

(h) P. 105.

As for *Saravia* and *Schola Parisiensis*, whom he alledgeth together in the next place, observe, 1. How little Mr Canne understands what the Authors be whom he alledgeth, not knowing whether they were Papists or Protestants, placing *Saravia* in the number of Papists: so well is he acquainted with the Authors he alledgeth at second hand; such injury he doth to his witnesses. So afterward (i) againe in this same book he wrongeth *Saravia* by setting him among the Popish Writers, and making him of their profession and religion, by accusing me to make the same objection and to use the same reason that Papists doe, and then giving instance in *Saravia* for one of them. What a blindenes and inconsideratenes is this in Mr Canne? II. He perverts the meaning both of *Saravia* and *Schola Parisiensis*; for what though they grant that *all Ecclesiasticall authority belongeth to the Church primarily, &c.* doth it follow hence that the power of Classicall and Provinciall Synods is *an und: power*, as W.B. and Mr C. accuse them? doth it not rather follow that there is a due power, secondarily and by delegation, in Synods, where the Deputies of the Churches meet together in their name? Mr Parker (k) from whom he hath both these testimonies, doth not so alledge them against the authority of Synods. He might have seen these words in the same place cited by Mr Parker out of Saravia, whereby authority is ascribed not onely unto the Church but also unto Synods, when he is (l) brought in saying, *Bishops & Arch-bishops have no authority, but what is conferred and bestowed upon them by the Church and Synods.* III. He perverts the meaning of *Schola Parisiensis*, which speakes not of particular Congregations, but of the Universall Church, and specially as it is represented in a Generall Councell. This is plaine and evident throughout that whole writing. IV. He doth deale deceitfully in his translation of that testimony of *Schol. Paris.* for the Doctours of Sorbon doe there say that all Ecclesiasticall authority doth belong to the Church primarily, properly, essentially, *but unto the Romane Pope and other Bishops instrumentally, ministerially, and for execution onely, &c.* instead of *the Romane Pope and other Bishops*, he puts in the word *Officers* onely to blinde the eyes of the Readers, who if those words had not bene left out, might easily have seene that they spake of such transcendent and usurped authority as is exercised by the Pope and his Bishops &c. Hence it may appeare what is to be judged of that which he inferres from this testimony, to make it serve his purpose in oppugning of Synods.

(i) P. 93. & 98.

(k) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. p. 29, 30. & 42.

(l) Ibid. p. 42.

As

As for *Alphonſus de Caſtro* and *Franciſcus Victoria*, 1. It is an errour to approve their teſtimony there (m) alledged, viz. that *all Biſhops doe receive juriſdiction and power immediately from God*: for then ſhould they all have an extraordinary calling, ſuch as the Apoſtles had, *Gal.* 1.1,15,16. whereas all ordinary Miniſters have their juriſdiction not immediately from God, but mediately by men, and from the Church. How erroneouſly doe W.B. and Mr C. put light for darknes and darknes for light, when they avouch, that *thus God ordered theſe mens tongues, to give witneſſe unto his trueth?* 11. All the ſhew of help which they pretend to have from this teſtimony is grounded upon that groundleſſe conſequence, whereby they inferre that Claſſes & Synods have no authority over particular Congregations, becauſe all Churches, Elderſhips and Officers are equall: This their aſſertion remaines yet to be proved; which we doe expreſſely deny, as I have (n) ſhewed in my anſwer unto his firſt Reaſon.

(m) Ch. pt. p.78,79.

(n) P. 159.

The teſtimonies of the three next Popiſh Authors, viz. *Cuſanus de concord. Cathol. l.* 1.*c.* 11,*&c. Sanders de viſib. Mon. l.*1.*c.*6. *Scultingius, Hierarch. Anarch. l.*4.*pag.*103. are all of them before alledged by (o) Mr Parker, from whence it ſeemes Mr Canne hath taken them, but without judgement, not applying them aright. for 1. When they affirme that Chriſts promiſe of giving the keyes unto Peter, *muſt be referred unto the whole Church*; as alſo that Peter *in perſon preſented the body of the Church*: though theſe ſpeeches ſhew the power of binding and looſing to be in the Church, yet can it not hence be inferred that a particular Congregation ought not to be ſubject unto the cenſure of Claſſes and Synods, or to ſtand under the authority of any Eccleſiaſticall judicatory out of itſelf, when that Congregation is complained of for errour or wrong doing. It is a perverting of theſe ſpeeches, and a falſe conſequence which is drawne from hence, that becauſe a Congregation hath power to judge the members thereof, therefore no other have power to judge of it. 11. When Mr Canne inferreth hence that the power of electing Miniſters is not in Claſſes or Synods, he beates the ayre, & erres from the Queſtion. When did I ever affirme any ſuch matter? or when did the Claſſis ever offer to obtrude a Miniſter upon us? 111. Theſe teſtimonies touching the Keyes given unto the Church, ſhew what power is in the Church originally and primarily; but yet they doe not import that the execution and exerciſe of this power is in the whole Church. Preaching and adminiſtration of the Sacraments are a part of that Eccleſiaſticall authority comprehended in the power of the Keyes; and yet the exerciſe thereof is not permitted to the whole Church, by the confeſſion of the Browniſts themſelves.

(o) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. c. 1. p. 2. & c. 3. p. 11.

For his next witneſſe, having alledged the words of *Ferus upon Act.* 11. that *the Church may not onely exact an account of her Miniſters, but alſo depoſe them, and reject them altogether if they be not fit, &c.* he inſulteth hereupon and gloryeth, ſaying, *What can be more for us then this?* I anſwer, This might have bene more for you, if he had ſayd, that when a Congregation hath depoſed their Miniſter, there is no other Eccleſiaſticall judicatory that may judge whether they have done well or ill. This had bene to the purpoſe: then had he abſolutely granted you the thing which the Browniſts ſtand for: but this he doth not. When Mr Canne was depo-

sed from his ministery by them of the Separation, and when they rejected him altogether, and left both his ministery and the fellowship of all that took part with him; was it not his & their misery that there was none to judge betwixt thē?

When he alledgeth the names of *Gratian*, *Gregorie*, *P. Æneas Sylvius*, *Pope Anacletus*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *Thomas of Aquine*, *Alexander of Ales*, *Iohn Scot*, *&c.* some of them affirming that *the greatest authority is in the Church*, that *the keyes were given to all the Apostles*; others *that all Bishops are equall in power, and the like*: these and the like speeches being alledged to prove the undue power of Classes and Synods, they are all perverted, neither can the question in controversy be ever concluded from hence against us. It is a most false consequence, to inferre that becaus all Bishops are equall in power, therefore Synods have no power to judge: and as false it is to inferre that becaus the Keyes were given to all the Apostles, therefore there is no Ecclesiasticall power to judge the actions of a particular Congregation.

In summe, Mr Canne doth most ignorantly and grosly abuse all these Papists, against their words, their writings, and their continuall profession and practise. For though there be this maine difference betwixt the Papists, that some of them doe ascribe the greatest authority unto the Church, that is, unto a Generall Synod, or Councell, maintayning that they have infallibility of judgement above the Pope, & power to depose the Pope; others of thē ascribing more authority and infallibility of judgement unto the Pope, rather then unto the Church or a Generall Councell representing the same: yet doe they all agree in this, that there is a superiour power above particular Congregations to judge the same.

The Universitty of *Paris*, and the Doctours of *Sorbon* have in speciall manner from time to time maintayned the authority of a Generall Councell above the Pope; they (p) bring many arguments from Scripture and other reasons to prove the same. They alledge the sentence of Pope (q) *Zozimus* confessing himself to be inferiour unto the Councell. They avouch that (r) *the frequent celebrating of Synods is simply and absolutely necessary for the better and more holy guiding of the Church.* Whereas a certaine Frier, *Ioannes Sarrazin*, had by word and writing under his hand preferred the authority of the Pope above the Synods, they (s) record at large and publish in print a most solemne decree made by the Theologicall faculty of that Universitty, whereby he was appointed to revoke his opinion, and a forme of recantation was prescribed, according to which he confessed his fault, & acknowledged the power of Synods above the Pope.

(p) De Eccl. & Polit. Pot. pag. 1. &c. edit. 1612. Paris.
(q) Ibid. p. 16.
(r) Ibid. p. 19.
(s) Ibid. p. 46–56.

The (t) Councell of *Constance* did not onely exercise Ecclesiasticall authority in condemning of *Iohn Husse* and *Hierome of Prage*, but also decreeing the authority of Synods and Councells to be above the Pope, did actually depose divers Popes, as *Iohn the 23th* and *Benedict*, who was likewise excommunicate by them: even as the Councell held at (v) *Brixia* had in former time by their sentence condemned Pope *Hildebrand*, and judged him to be deposed. So in like manner did the Councell held at (x) *Basile*, depose Pope *Eugenius*, & put another in his place. By all which it is evident what the Papists then judged of the authority and power of Synods.

(t) Acts & Monum. p. 546, & 547. An. D. 1414, &c.
(v) An. D. 1083. Act. & Mon. p. 164.
(x) Ibid. p. 632, 634.

As all these, so the other faction of Papists, and the *Iesuites* in speciall, that maintaine

taine the authority of the Pope to be above all Synods & Councells whatsoever, & that their decrees are not of force, unleſſe they be approved by the Pope; theſe doe evidently teach that the affaires and controverſies of particular Congregations are ſubject to the judgement of ſuperiour judicatories out of themſelves. This is to be obſerved in *Bellarmine* throughout his writings, where he ſhewes (y) the cauſes, the neceſſity, and the authority of Generall and Provinciall Synods, the (z) power of elections, and the diſtinction of a Biſhop from a Preſbyter. The ſame is maintayned by him in his (a) treatiſe of Pardons or Indulgencies, plenary or for a certaine number of dayes, for the living or for the dead. And the like is to be found in (b) ſundry other of his writings.

(y) Tom. 2. Contr. 1. de Concil. l. 1. c. 9, 10, 11. & l. 2. c. 2, &c.

(z) Tom. 2. Contr. 2. l. 1. de Cler. c. 7, 8, 9, 10. & 14. &c.

(a) Tom. 3. Contr. 4. de Indul. l. 1. c. 11, 14. & l. 2. c. 1, &c.

(b) Tom. 3. Contr. 5. de Sacr. Ord. l. 1. c. 11.

And to theſe might be added more then an hundred of other witneſſes, of the Romiſh Church, acknowledging that there is a due and lawfull power of Synods and of other judges to decide the cauſes & controverſies of particular Churches. Inſtead of many other, the *Councell of Trent*, called by (c) Pope *Paulus* the third, continued by (d) Pope *Iulius* the third, and confirmed by (e) Pope *Pius* the fourth, together with the conſideration of many concluſions and decrees made in ſeverall Seſſions of that Councell, doe give plenteous teſtimony hereof throughout that whole book of their Acts.

Tom. 1. Contr. 1. de Verbo Dei, l. 3. c. 3, &c.

(c) Concil. Trid. Bul. Indict. p. 8.

(d) Bul. Reſumpt. p. 66, 67.

(e) Bul. Confirm. p. 243, &c.

Onely to conclude this Section, let it be remembred how of old in our owne countrie, the like teſtimony hath bene given to ſhew the authority of Synods. We read (f) of a Provinciall Synod at *Thetford* in the time of Theodore, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, *Anno D.* 680. where it was ordained that Provinciall Synods ſhould be kept within the Realme at leaſt once a yeare. Another Synod (g) was held at *Wincheſter*, *Anno D.* 1070. where *Stigandus* Archbiſhop of Canterbury was depoſed for receyving his pall from *Benedict* the fift: And another (h) was after held at *London*, where many decrees were made in the time of *Lanfranck*, the Archbiſhop, &c. This being the continuall and univerſall practiſe of the Papiſts, what ſenſe was there in Mr Canne to alledge their teſtimonies in ſuch a poynt wherein they are ſo full and pregnant againſt him? It is the fault of Papiſts, that they give too much authority unto Synods; and it is as groſſe a fault of theſe my oppoſites, to pervert their teſtimonies, contrary to their meaning & practiſe, further then their words will beare.

Tom. 1. Contr. 3. de Sum. Pont. l. 4. c. 1, 2, 3, &c.

(f) Act. & Mon. p. 112. col. 2. art. 7. (g) Ibid. p. 155. (h) P. 157.

Sect. II.

Touching the Teſtimonies of Lutheranes.

IN their firſt allegation taken from Lutheranes they ſay, *It is affirmed by the* Centuries *of* Meydenburg, *that from Chriſts aſcenſion, unto Trajans time, which is about a* 100 *yeares*, every particular Church was governed, by the Biſhops, Elders and Deacons of the ſame. *Cent.* 1. *c.* 4. To this I anſwer: This allegation comes ſhort of the queſtion in hand, and is therefore inſufficient and perverted to prove that the Churches then did not ſtand under any other Eccleſiaſticall authority: for it is not affirmed by them of *Meydenburgh* in their Centuries, that the Churches were governed by them alone, or that there were no Synods in thoſe times to

judge of the actions of Bishops, Elders, and Deacons, in cases of controversy which could not be well ended in particular Churches; but the contrary is expressely taught by the same (i) Authors. Particular Churches among us also are governed by their owne Bishops, Elders, & Deacons, though not by them alone, especially in matters of greater difficulty. Whereas they alledge another place on this manner, *Cent.6.7.col.*591. there is a notable abuse therein. for, 1. What reason had they to alledge the history of the sixt Centurie to shew what was done in the first Centurie, from Christs Ascension to Trajans time? 2. As for the (k) 7th chapter of that Centurie, there are more then an 100 or 200 testimonies shewing the power of Metropolitane Bishops, and of Archbishops, which they exercised in many Churches, Antichrist being almost come to his height at that time. 3. As for that place of the sixt Century poynted at by his marginall quotation, viz. *Col.*591. All that is there specifyed at large in the story concerning Richaredus a King of Spaine, converted from Arianisme, & submitting himself unto the (l) Synod then assembled, is against them that include all Ecclesiasticall authority within one Congregation onely. If these quotations be misprinted, it was great negligence in Mr Canne to look no better to his work.

(i) Magdeb. Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 9. de Cõc. col. 546. & c. 7. col. 522. & 542.

(k) Col. 404. &c.

(l) Syn. Tolet. 3.

Againe it is alledged from the *Magdeburgenses*, *Cent.2.c.7.p.*134,135. that *from Trajans raigne unto Severus, from the yeare of Christ* 100 *to* 195, *If any read the approved Authors of this age, he shall see that the order of Government was popular: for all Churches had equall power, &c.* This testimony is also abused. 1. There is one falsification in mistranslating of the words: for they doe not say that then *the government was popular*, as Mr Canne sets it downe; nor yet that it was *like* unto a popular government; but onely this is sayd, that it was *almost like* unto a popular government, *propemodum* δημοκρατίας *similem fuisse*: And how great is the difference betwixt these assertions? even as much as there is betwixt being a Christian, and almost a Christian; so plainly distinguished, *Act.*26.29. 2. What though the govern-mẽt of the Church was almost like a Democracie? Or what though all Churches had equall power then? Could they not therefore stand under the authority of Synods? It is a perverted reasoning so to argue. Even here all the Reformed Churches among us haye equall power, and are partly Democraticall, and yet are mutually and equally subject to one another in their Synods. 3. There is another egregious falsification in the alledging of this testimony, by omitting that which principally concernes the Question: for when these of *Magdeburg* say here, that all Churches had equall power of teaching the Word, administring of Sacraments, excommunicating, ordination and depolition of Ministers, they adde withall in the same Chapter, and in the very same sentence & period, in the words immediately following touching this equall power of Churches, that it was for *the gathering of Synods and Assemblies*, and this not for counsell onely, but *for the judging and deciding of matters doubtfull and controverted.* And not onely this, but after againe in the same page, (m) this power of Synods in judging and excommunicating of Hereticks, is further declared and repeated, it being the very scope of that Section to describe the power of Synods in the consociation of Churches. And further in this same (n) Century, as in others according to their order, they doe

(m) Col. 135.

(n) Cent. 2. c. 9. de Cõc. col. 159, 160. &c.

rehearse

rehearſe divers Synods held in thoſe times, as that at Rome, at Ceſarea in Paleſtine, & others in France, in Pontus, in Achaia, &c.

In the next place confounding the order propounded by himſelf, he brings in among his Lutherane witneſſes, (o) *Mr Brightman*, who as he ſaith, comes downe lower, even unto Conſtantines time, and is of opinion, that *the primitive puritie of Church government, was not yet defloured with the dregges of mans invention: Neither had Satã brought in Prelaticall pride into the ſheepfold of the Lord: but the Paſtours looked every one to the health of his owne flock. Hence it appeares* (ſayth Mr Canne) *that for the ſpace of 200 or 300 yeares after Chriſt, every viſible Church had power to exerciſe Eccleſiaſticall government, &c.* Now to ſhew how vainely this is alledged, 1. Obſerve how farre it is from the Queſtion: for though the Paſtours looked every one to the health of his owne flock, this prooves not that the power of Claſſes and Synods is an undue power. Doth he thinke that either I or any Miniſter of theſe Reformed Churches will not acknowledge the ſame? Yea doe not Paſtours then looke the better to the ſafety of their flockes, when as in needfull caſes they ſeek the help of Synods therein? 2. Let him conſider his (p) former witneſſes what they ſay concerning this third age of the Church, ſhewing in what manner Paſtours did then looke to the health of their flock. *If any weighty queſtions, diſſenſions or Hereſies aroſe, they did nothing by their private counſell, neither durſt they, &c. but calling together other fellow-Biſhops of the ſame Province, either all or many, by conferring their judgements together, they decided the queſtions, compounded the diſſenſions, refuted the Hereſies, and excommunicated them that were obſtinate, &c.* And this is further ſhewed at large by many inſtances and examples in the ſame place. And (q) after againe they deſcribe divers Synods that were held in thoſe times in Aſia, Europe and Africa, for the exerciſe of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction in deciding of controverſies, &c. 3. That Mr Brightmans words are perverted and wreſted to a wrong end, againſt the authority of Synods, contrary to his meaning, it appeareth by the rare and pregnant teſtimony he gives unto them in the (r) ſame book, where he teacheth that the viſion and type of the Angel ſtanding at the golden Altar before the throne with a golden cenſer full of incenſe, was accompliſhed in *Conſtantine the great*, gathering together ſo many holy men in the Synod or Councell of *Nice* for the deciding of the controverſy about *Arius*, and ſhewes that the wholeſome concluſion and happy iſſue of that Synod, effected by the care, labour, diligence and charges of *Conſtantine*, was acceptable to God in Chriſt, and as a thick cloud of incenſe aſcending out of the hand of the Angel in the preſence of God. And thus alſo he (ſ) interprets a former viſion of another Angel that came up from the riſing of the Sunne, having the ſeale of the living God, to ſeale the ſervants of God in their foreheads. This he expounds of *Conſtantine* and of the *Nicene* Synod, he being the principall inſtrument to call that Synod. While the Godhead of Chriſt coequall and conſubſtantiall with the Father was maintained in that Synod, and the trueth ſpread abroad by the authority of Conſtantine and of that Synod, and many confirmed in the profeſſion thereof, thereby they were ſealed in their foreheads, & the name both of the Lamb and of the Father was imprinted on their foreheads, according to that in *Rev.* 14. 1.

(o) On Rev. 12. 1.

(p) Magdeb. Cent. 3. c. 7. col. 161. &c.

(q) Cent. 3. c. 9. de Syn. col. 192, 193, &c.

(r) On Rev. 8. 3, 4.

(ſ) On Rev. 7. 2, 3.

In

In the exposition of that mysticall Song of Solomon, where there is mention made of *a fountaine of gardens, a well of living waters, and streames from Lebanon*, this (t) Cõment. in Cantic. c. 4. v. 15. p. 75, 76. Mr Brightman doth also (t) interpret and particularly apply unto the Synod of *Nice*: The decrees of that Synod are by him avouched to be the living waters to refresh and make fruitfull the gardens of God, which are the Churches of Christ. And while he alledgeth such divine warrant to prove the fruit and benefit of Synods, how injurious is Mr Canne unto him in perverting his testimony? yea how injurious to the Church of God in drying up these fountaines of comfort, by his impugning the authority of Synods?

Besides this, to omit other the like testimonies of Mr Brightman touching Synods, even in that (v) very place mentioned by Mr Canne, touching the purity of the primitive Church, Mr Brightm. maketh mention of *Paulus Samosatenus* & the Synodicall Epistle concerning him, and so leadeth us to that story, which shewes the power of Synods in that primitive age. For there we read that about the yeare of Christ 280, there was a (x) Synod held at *Antioch*, where many Bishops and others met together from many Churches and out of divers Provinces, who did not onely give counsell about the controversy, but gave sentence against *Paulus Samosatenus*, and by common consent rejected and excommunicated him; *Aurelianus* the Emperour using his authority to represse the insolency of that person when he would have resisted the Synod. The same story is recorded also by the (y) *Magdeburgenses* in their Centuries, shewing that divers Synods were held at *Antioch* about that busines before it could be finished.

(v) On Rev. 12. 1.

(x) Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 26, 27, 28. & 29. edit. Basil. 1611.

(y) Cent. 3. c. 9. col. 206, 207.

Whereas they doe here in their marginall note send me to see what *Mr Iacob* saith, *Necess. of Reform. p. 57. &c.* I have long since seene what he writes both in that place, and in other of his treatises published of later time: and though he went too farre in this businesse, yet I finde that he disallowes the practise & judgment of the Brownists, and wonders at their blindenes, and bewailes it. For speaking of *Morellius* and the popular government which he strove for, he sayth, (z) *Some of the* Separation, *I grant, are too offensive this way: which I am heartily sory for. They take the wordes in Matth. 18. 17.* Tell the Church, *more popularly then there is need, or then reason or good order would. Howbeit in this yet they hold the substance of the true* Church-*government. They erre but in the circumstance of order, though it be too* (a) foule *That is, they will examine all scandalls, &c. whatsoever in the presence and under the judgement of the whole multitude perpetually and necessarily. I say perpetually and necessarily. Wherein I wonder they see not the many very ill Consequents, which will and must ensue many times.* And afterwards againe in the same (b) chapter, he saith, *But to hold those popular circumstances in every Church perpetuall and necessary absolutely as the* Separation *doth, it was neither* Cyprians *meaning nor* Christs, *nor any well advised Christians.* Yea upon this his testimony touching the disorder of the Brownists, he sets this note and mark of his vehement dislike in the margine of that page, *Separation itself is no such error, as this is.* And this ought seriously to be considered of Mr Canne and his client.

(z) Attestat. c. 8. p. 249.

(a) Beza, Annot. in Mat. 18. 17.

(b) P. 280, 281.

In the next place (c) he brings divers allegations of Scriptures and other Authors to prove that we may not change the Apostolick Government, nor leave their

(c) Ch. pl. p. 81.

their inſtitutions, &c. In all which he beates the ayre, and trifles, leaving the queſtion that is betwixt us, as I have noted (d) before: ſeeing they prove not that the authority of Synods is againſt the Apoſtolick inſtitution. Come we therefore unto his teſtimonies of Lutheranes, & of ſuch as he confuſedly mingles with them, viz. of *Zuinglius*, *Luther*, *Chemnitius*, *Melanćthon*, *Sarcerius*, *Brentius*, *D. Rungius*, *Hunnius*, *Oſiander*, *Salneccer*, *Pelargus*, *D. Mylius*, *Hegendorphin*, *&c.* Theſe all are notably perverted by him. for to anſwer firſt in generall: What though theſe teach that the power of excommunication, of calling Miniſters, &c. is in the whole Church; doth it therefore follow that Synods may not judge the actions of a whole Congregation if they abuſe their power? If Congregations call a Miniſter, though never ſo vile or ſo unworthy, or if they would excommunicate an innocent perſon; ſhall there be no liberty of appeale unto a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall judicatory for the redreſſe of ſuch wrongs? Or doe any of his Lutherane witneſſes condemne ſuch an appeale? This he ought to have concluded from their Teſtimonies by ſome juſt conſequence, if he would have ſpoken to the purpoſe. The inſultation of Mr C. and W.B. upon theſe teſtimonies is moſt vaine, & containeth many falſhoods. It is falſe that my opinion is *a new opinion* as they call it: It is falſe that theſe Lutheranes are *contrary unto me*: It is falſe that upon my grounds *Officers how vile ſoever muſt be left alone, if Miniſters of other Churches judge them fit to continue*: It is groſſely falſe that the power which I leave unto particular Churches is *juſt nothing*: It is an open and foule falſhood, that theſe many Authors alledged doe *conſent fully with them*, viz. with Mr Canne and W. Beſt. But this will more plainly appeare, if we take a particular ſurvey of the chief of thoſe witneſſes here produced, whoſe teſtimonies he vouchſafeth to ſet downe.

(d) P. 145, &c.

The firſt of theſe is *Zuinglius*, who though he was no Lutherane, as Mr Canne notes in his margine, who had promiſed to ſet downe his allegations taken from Lutheranes, next after the Papiſts; yet here he is brought in with *Luther*. And as he is miſplaced in reſpect of the order which Mr C. propounded to himſelf, ſo his teſtimonies both touching excommunication and calling of Miniſters are unjuſtly alledged againſt us. In the firſt ſort of teſtimonies touching excommunication, not to ſpeake of Mr Cannes altering and tranſpoſing his Authors words to make them ſerve his owne purpoſe, *Zuinglius* reprooves the abuſes and enormities of the Pope and his Biſhops, undertaking by their ſole authority to excommunicate thoſe that were none of their Church. His words are theſe, (e) *No private man may excommunicate, but the Church wherein he that is to be excommunicated doth dwell, together with the Biſhop*. And in the explication of that Article, having ſpoken of other abuſes about excõmunication, he ſaith, *Can the Biſhop alone excõmunicate? Excõmunication doth not belong unto any one man whoſoever he be, but unto the Church*. By theſe & the like ſpeeches of *Zuinglius* it appeares that his teſtimonies are not prejudiciall unto our practiſe, nor unto that authority of Synods which we maintaine: ſeeing we grant that no one perſon alone can by right excommunicate any man by his owne authority; neither can any Church or Churches excommunicate thoſe that are not in communion with them. The other place cited out of *Zuinglius*, touching the calling of Miniſters, is ſo farre from prooving any thing againſt us, that being

(e) Art. 31.

duely considered it may fitly serve to blame those popular courses which Mr Can. pleades for, and to justify our practise in not performing this weighty businesse without the advise and approbation of neighbour Ministers assembled in the Classis. *Zuinglius* in that treatise called *Ecclesiastes*, having spoken of the Popish tyranny, bereaving most Churches of the liberty of election, he reprooves another extreme, saying, (f) *If there were any Church unto which election was yet left free, the common people rashly, without all deliberation, and without all counsell of learned, prudent and faithfull men, did choose those whom they did most favour, & not such as were indued with true vertues beseeming a Bishop. Therefore there is nothing so agreeable unto the Divine ordinance and ancient institution, as that the whole Congregation of a faithfull people, together with some learned and godly Bishops, or other faithfull and experienced men, doe make choyse of a Pastour.* Thus he plainly disavowes the independency of Churches in such cases, not allowing a Congregation to proceed unto the election of a Minister, without the assistance of the Ministers of other Churches, and to this effect he explaines himself further in the same place, saying, *It is meet that the power of election should be in the Church being furnished with the counsels of faithfull and learned men. For as that matter may not lye in the power of any one man, so neither may the rude and unlearned multitude take upon them so great a weight of election, &c.* And in the same leafe speaking of Anabaptists intruding themselves into the Churches of their owne accord, he proves that they are no lawfull Ministers becaufe they have not a due calling, thus, *Bishops they are not. for they are not chosen of any Church by lawfull and unanimous consent, the authority of other Bishops excelling in faith and prudence, also concurring.* Observe how that with the free consent of the people he joynes not onely the counsell or advise, as he had called it before, but the *authority* of the Officers of other Congregations.

(f) Eccles. Tom. 2. f. 54.

Moreover that *Zuinglius* did not absolutely deny the authority of Synods, though he speake much against Popish Synods, may appeare if we consider the reasons which he useth against them, viz. becaufe they were not assembled in the holy Ghost, becaufe they did not judge of matters according to the Scriptures, but according to the ordinances and customes of men, &c. Now this is not to dispute against the thing itself, but against the abuse of it. And therefore having spoken against such Councels, of the Pope, Cardinals, and Bishops, in such sort as Mr Canne had alledged him (g) before, he addes withall, (h) *I speake onely of these that are such; my writings shall not hurt others, who set themselves under the Scriptures, not above the Scriptures.* And that these conditions for the want whereof he opposed those Popish Synods, may yet be found in other Synods which have made decrees for the deciding of controversies rayfed in the Church, he acknowledgeth in these words, (i) *If the Councill of Gangra were assembled in the holy Ghost (which no good man will deny, while he sees that the decrees thereof doe agree with the lawes of the Gospell and with the doctrine of the Apostles) it was unworthily done of those that came after, that have disanulled the decrees thereof, without being moved by any authority of the Scriptures.* Againe in another place, speaking of the foure Generall Councels, though he justly blame those that accounted them to be of equall authority with the foure Evangelists, yet he saith, (k) *Truely I would not have any thing to be detracted from them.* He was not there-

(g) Ch. pl. p. 75.
(h) Art. 8. expl.
(i) Paræneſ. ad cõmun. Helvet. civ. Tom. 1. f. 116.
(k) Archeteles, T. 1. f. 137.

therefore of Mr Cannes minde, who will have all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction to be detracted or removed from Synods. Beſides, *Zuinglius* doth not onely approve of theſe Synods held in former times, but he alſo ſhewes himſelf ready to joyne in the like practiſe, even in the exerciſe of the ſame Eccleſiaſticall authority that was uſed in thoſe Synods. For when the Magiſtrates of *Zurich* had aſſembled together all the Miniſters of the Churches both in their city and countrie, and had procured the preſence of divers others, for the ſolemne vindicating of the doctrine taught in their Churches; there *Faber*, Vicar of the Biſhop of Conſtance, having ſpoken of a Generall Councell, that it onely had authority to determine theſe things, *Zuinglius* replyes, (l) *Whereas in this our aſſembly there be ſo many right faithfull men, both of our owne countrey and ſtrangers, and furthermore ſeeing here be ſo many godly & learned Biſhops preſent, who doubtles have a deſire not onely to heare and underſtand, but alſo to advance divine trueth: verily I ſee nothing to hinder even in this place, whereby it ſhould not be lawfull for us, according to the Vicars meaning, to diſpute of theſe things, and to decree what trueth teacheth. But other nations (he ſayth) will never conſent unto theſe our decrees: &c.* By theſe and the like (m) paſſages it is evident that *Zuinglius* did allow the Miniſters of ſeverall Congregations, aſſembled in a Synod, not onely to conſult and diſpute, but alſo to determine, yea and to make decrees for the removing of controverſies & ſettling peace in the Church, while they did it according to the Scriptures, which is the ſame that we maintaine.

(l) Act. Diſp. 1. Tom. 2. f. 610.

(m) Ibid. f. 621. &c.

The words of *Mr Luther*, whom he cites in the next place, as they are to no purpoſe alledged againſt us, ſeeing they touch not the queſtion, as I ſhewed before; ſo being compared with other his writings, they make it appeare that theſe two propoſitions may well ſtand together, viz. that the Church hath power to judge, to call, to depoſe, &c. and yet that all Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction is not confined within the bounds of a particular Congregation, but that Synods & Councells have authority to judge of Church affaires and to cenſure offendours: foraſmuch as *Luther* doth as plainly and as fully avouch the one as the other. In the yeare 1518, having underſtood that they proceeded againſt him in the Popes Court at Rome, and that an unjuſt ſentence was likely to be pronounced by them, (n) he appealed from the Pope to a Councell or Synod. The compleat forme of his Appeale is recorded (o) among his workes, wherein he doth plainly acknowledge the Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction of Synods, both by the whole drift and ſubſtance thereof, and when he ſaith that *a ſacred Councell being lawfully aſſembled in the holy Ghoſt, repreſenting the holy Catholick Church, is in cauſes concerning the faith above the Pope, &c.* This his Appeale was repeated and further urged in the yeare 1520, when the Pope had condemned and excommunicated him. Among other reaſons which he uſeth to reenforce his Appeale, he alledgeth this, (p) that the Pope *moſt wickedly preferred his owne tyranny above the power of the Councell, &c.* and therefore he beſeecheth the Emperour and other Magiſtrates that *for the glory of God, and for the maintaining of the liberty of a Councell, they would admit of his Appeale, and repreſſe the others tyranny, &c.* In the yeare 1539, he wrote a booke in the German tongue *de Concilijs*, concerning Councels or Synods, where though he inveigh ſeverely, and not without cauſe, againſt the Pope for his fruſtrating the deſires of

(n) Sleid. Comment. lib. 1.

(o) Tom. 1. f. 231. edit. 1545.

(p) Tom. 2. f. 52. Sleid. Com. l. 2.

thoſe that ſought a Generall Councell, & admitting of none but where he might ſway all by his owne authority and command; yet he doth fully approve of that Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction which had bene formerly exerciſed in Synods & Councells lawfully aſſembled and rightly ordered. *A Councell* (ſaith (q) he) *is nothing els but a Conſiſtory, a Court of juſtice, an Imperiall Chamber, or the like, where the Iudge having heard the parties, pronounceth ſentence, but with this condition, that it be according to Law, &c. Thus a Councell condemnes an Heretick, not according to their owne opinion, but according to the Royall law, that is, according to the holy Scripture, as they profeſſe, which is the Law of the holy Church.* Speaking of the right and power of Councells, having ſhewed (r) that it is not lawfull for them to make new Articles of faith, to command any new work, to binde mens conſciences to new ceremonies, nor to intermeddle with Civill government; he declareth withall that it is their duety to condemne new doctrines contrary to the Scriptures, and to cenſure the perſons, to remove and condemne new ceremonies that are ſuperſtitious or unprofitable for the Church, and to examine and judge of thoſe things that are controverted as it is preſcribed in the word of God. Moreover demanding what the office or work of a Councell is, he anſwers, (ſ) *Anathematiſamus*, [*we pronounce Anathema*] *ſo is their office called. Anathematiſat Eccleſia, the holy Church condemnes* or excommunicates. So farre was Luther from denying the authority of Synods, that he allowes them the power of pronouncing this heavie ſentence of *Anathema* or Excommunication.

(q) Oper. German. Tom. 7. f. 260. edit. 1562.

(r) Ibid. f. 257. &c. Sleid. Com. l. 12.

(ſ) Ubi ſupra. f. 260.

To proceed unto his other witneſſes, there is nothing in the words alledged out of *Chemnitius* and *Polycarpus Lyſerus* (who is the Authour of that part of the *Harmony*, quoted under the name of *Chemnitius*) that by any juſt conſequence can be oppoſed unto our doctrine and practiſe, touching election, excommunication, examination of ſentences, &c. Onely obſerve how Mr Canne here abuſeth his Authour and his Readers by his imperfect allegation, ſetting downe this teſtimony of *Chemnitius* in ſuch manner, as if that which was ſayd with an expreſſe condition, had bene uttered ſimply and abſolutely without any ſuch reſtraint. *Chemnitius* ſayth indeed that *election or calling doth belong unto the whole Church:* but how? that Mr Canne leaves out, as unfit for his purpoſe, which his Authour addes immediately in the ſame period, ſaying that it belongs unto the whole Church, *certo quodam modo, in ſuch wiſe that both the Preſbytery and the people have each their owne ſhare in the choyſe or calling.* Chemnitius in that (t) learned diſcourſe touching the calling of Miniſters, intends principally to prove, againſt the Councell of Trent, that the conſent of the people and of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate is requiſite in elections: but withall he gives as full and plaine teſtimony for the judgement, examination and approbation of the Preſbytery; under which he comprehends the Miniſters of other Congregations, called Biſhops and Clerkes in the places alledged by him. And this kinde of election he ſhewes to be agreeable unto the practiſe of the Apoſtolick, primitive, ancient, and their owne moderne Churches. Beſides *Chemnitius* doth ſufficiently declare his judgement touching the authority of Synods, which is our maine queſtion, in divers pregnant paſſages of that book which he wrote againſt the Councell of Trent. He (v) alledgeth & commendeth the words of

(t) Exam. Conc. Trid. par. 2. de Sacram. Ord. Can. 7.

(v) Exam. Conc. Trid. par. 1. præf.

of Auguſtine, ſaying that *moſt wholeſome is the authority of Councels in the Church, while they judge according to the rule and ſquare of the holy Scripture, &c.* He ſaith (x) that many have often wiſhed and long waited for a true, lawfull, free, and Chriſtian Councell, as the *right medicine* for the curing of thoſe manifold errours and abuſes that were crept into the Church. He doth frequently alledge and approve the acts of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction exerciſed in former Synods, throughout that whole booke. He ſaith indeed in one of the places cited by Mr Canne (y) that the decrees of Councells are to be examined by the rule of the Scripture: but this doth no more empaire that authority of Synods which we aſſcribe unto them, then it doth the power of all Church-acts and ſentences whatſoever, concerning which Chemnitius (z) ſayth the ſame thing; and Mr Canne cannot deny but that they are to be examined and tryed by the word of God, though they be made in ſuch manner as he himſelf (a) requireth.

(x) Ibid. Exam. Decret. 1, & 2.

(y) Ibid. præf.

(z) Exam. par. 1. de bon. op. qu. 2.

(a) Ch. pl. p. 95.

There is another allegation of *Chemnitius* touching the diſtinction betwixt *power* and the *adminiſtration* of it, which Mr Canne hath taken at all adventures, as it ſeemes, from *Mr Parker*, or rather from the Scribe or Printer, that cauſed that quotation [*Exam. c. 6.*] to ſtand ſo defectively (b) in his booke; and as he is thus briefe and obſcure in the quotation, ſo he is as ſparing in the application of this teſtimony unto his purpoſe, bidding us onely obſerve what is attributed *to the Congregation, what to the guides thereof; to the firſt power, to the latter the adminiſtration of it.* For the thing it ſelf, we grant that there is ſuch a diſtinction alledged out of *Luther*, and explained by *Chemnitius*, teaching (c) *that Chriſt hath delivered and commended the Keyes, that is, the miniſtery of the Word and Sacraments, unto the whole Church; but not ſo, that everie one raſhly and of his owne accord ſhould take unto himſelf and exerciſe that miniſtery without a lawfull calling: but that after immediate calling hath ceaſed, God ſends the Miniſters of the Word and Sacraments, by the calling and election of the Church, if it be performed according to the direction of his word; ſo that the chiefe power of the Word and Sacraments is in God; ſecondly that the miniſtery is in the Church, as by which God doth mediately call, chooſe, and ſend Miniſters; thirdly in thoſe who are lawfully choſen and called of God by the Church, as in the Miniſters, to whom is commanded the exerciſe or adminiſtration of the miniſtery of the Word and Sacraments.* Not to ſpeake of ſome difference, which the Reader may eaſily perceive, betwixt Mr Cannes allegation and his Authors words; there is nothing here ſayd that doth any way prejudice the juriſdiction of Synods, neither can he from hence inferre any thing againſt us. Moreover if that diſtinctiō be conſidered according to the meaning of the Authors from whence it is taken, it doth flatly contradict the opinion and practiſe of Mr Canne and others of the Separation, who will have not onely the power but alſo the execution or adminiſtration of it to be in the people promiſcuouſly, when all cauſes muſt be brought to the body of the Congregation, there to be heard and determined. Thus *Mr Parker* (d) oppoſeth this diſtinction unto the Democratie or popular government of *Morellius*, whom *Mr Iacob* in this reſpect parallels with them of the *Separation*, as was noted (e) before. Theſe maintaine that the people are to exerciſe their power in judging of cauſes, which the ſayd Authors, both Chemnitius and Mr Parker, conceive to be derived into the Ariſtocraticall part or

(b) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. p. 26.

(c) Exam. Conc. Trid. par. 2. de ſacram. in gē. Can. 10.

(d) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. p. 26.

(e) P. 176.

Officers of the Church, for the ordinary exercise of it; she still retaining her interest therein so farre that in matters of speciall moment nothing be concluded without her knowledge and consent. That moderating and guiding of the action, which Mr Canne and those of his minde reserve onely unto the Officers of the Church, in which respect he doth here call them *Guides*, cannot make that difference betwixt the judiciall exercising of power, as it is in the Officers, and the first receyving of that power, which is sayd to be in the whole Church by those that maintaine that distinction. In a word, they say that the exercise of this power doth not ordinarily belong unto the people, he saith that it doth. Such is the agreemēt betwixt Mr Canne and his witnesses.

Melanchthon, whom he alledgeth for the same purpose with Chemnitius (as Mr Parker had done (f) before) hath not any thing in the place mentioned that sounds that way. He speakes there [*Loc. Theol. de Regno Christi*] onely of the spirituall kingdome of Christ, against the Jewes and some sorts of Anabaptists. Nevertheless seeing he was one of speciall eminency among those with whom he is here joyned, it may be usefull to observe how Mr Canne is condemned by this witnesse also, whom he hath sought to produce against us in this controversy touching the authority of Synods. Among other Articles propounded unto the Protestants to ensnare them, this being also questioned, *Whether the holy Oecumenicall and receyved Synods have erred*, Melanchthon answers, (g) *By this generall demand they seek to kindle hatred against us, as if we seemed to reprehend all Synods & all things that have been acted in Synods. But we professe openly, that there ought to be judgements in the Church; and we affirme that there have been many godly Synods and profitable unto the Church; and we doe greatly wish now in these dissentions that the judgement of the Church might be rightly settled.* If he had bene of Mr Cann. minde, he should have answered farre otherwise, viz. that all those Synods erred that exercised any Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, that they were to be blamed for the making of all those Actes wherein such authority and power was implyed, such as were generally all the Actes of the Synods of *Antioch, Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Gangra, &c.* which as he saith in the same place, their Churches doe imbrace; he should have sayd also according to Mr Cannes principles, that though there may and ought to be judgements, that is, Ecclesiasticall sentences and censures in particular Congregations, that yet they ought not to be in Synods, or Assemblies of Ministers of severall Congregations, that these have no such power to judge, that no such determinations are to be desired. But Melanchthon we see, declares himself to be an opposite unto such conceits: and lest we should thinke that by the *judgements of the Church* he meant not such as are exercised in Synods, or that by *judgements* he understood rather acts of consultation, inquisition & deliberatiō, then of determination, and pronouncing of sentences; heare how he explaines himself elswhere, saying, (h) *There are in the Church judgments concerning doctrine, which are called Synods.* And againe, *Synods are ordinary judgements, which are pronounced against the unwilling, as they use to say. And the Church is commanded to make a lawfull inquiry, which being done, if [sentence] be rightly pronounced, obedience is to be yeelded. And if any doe not obey, he is justly punished.* He hath also upon other occasions given plaine and pregnant testi-

(f) Ubi supra, p. 26.

(g) Respōs. ad Artic. Bavar. Art. 7.

(h) Enarr. Symb. Nic. Tom. 1. f. 391.

teſtimonies of his judgement in this particular: among the reſt, that eſpecially is worthy our obſervation, which he writes in a certaine Diſputation concerning Synods; it being one of thoſe Diſputations which *Luther* by a preface thereunto prefixed hath commended unto the Readers, for which cauſe it ſeemes, they are alſo inſerted among *Luthers* workes, as being in ſpeciall manner approoved by „him. (i) There *Melanthon* intending to ſpeak of Synods, reaſoneth thus: It is (i) Luth. „moſt true and moſt agreeable unto the nature of men that which Plato ſayth, Tom. 1. f. „that the beſt ſtate of a Common-wealth is that which is the meane betwixt Ty- 444, 445. „rannie and Democratie, [or popular government.] This is to be framed and „maintained, as in all government ſo eſpecially in the Church. Both theſe, Ty- „rannie and Democratie, are to be avoyded and deteſted in the Church, as moſt „noyſome plagues. It is Tyrannie to conſtraine men to approve of manifeſt im- „pietie, to obey contrary to the cleare word of God, &c. Againe Democratie „alſo muſt be removed from the Church, that is, the common people without „difference are not to have licence or power granted unto them to alter doc- „trines, or to give ſentence concerning doctrines, for the Multitude alſo, as He- „rodotus ſayth, is a moſt cruell Tyrant. But a middle ſtate is to be ſought, that „is, Ariſtocratie ought to be eſtabliſhed, wherein by proportion the authority of „the learnedeſt and beſt men may be the greateſt. This Ariſtocratie Paul requi- „reth, 1. *Cor.* 14. *Gal.* 2. and it is moſt gravely written unto the Romanes, that „every one muſt know the meaſure of his owne faith. *Rom.* 12. Therefore that „tyrannicall ſpeech is to be hiſſed at, which takes away this proportion in the „Church, and aſſcribes unto the Pope an unbounded Tyrannie, viz. which af- „firmes that greater is the authority of the Pope then of the whole Councell be- „ſide, &c. In the choyſe of judges the beſt way is to follow that meane betwixt „Tyrannie and Democratie, namely to chooſe the beſt and the learnedeſt. When „by the conſent of both parties good and learned judges are choſen, and matters „have bene examined in order, it is meet there ſhould be an obeying of their judg- „ment: for every one ought to know the meaſure of his owne faith. Thus Me- lanthon hath fully declared himſelf in this controverſy touching the ground of Synodall government, together with the power and uſe of the ſame: yet for fur- ther ſatisfaction it may be obſerved how that in another place he applyes that which is here ſpoken againſt Democratie or popular order, unto that part thereof which Mr Canne ſo much pleades for, concerning election unto Church-offices, „when he ſayth, (k) According to ancient cuſtome the Church did chooſe, that (k) Ibid. f. „is, theſe to whom the Church hath committed this buſineſſe, & the judgement 442. „and approbation of the Biſhop ordaining did alſo concurre. Contrary to divine „right and to the ancient Church is that Democratie, where the people doe „ſnatch unto themſelves the election, without the judgement & approbation of Paſtours. By *Paſtours* he meanes doubtles the Miniſters of other Congregations, ſeeing he ſpeakes of them in the plurall number, and ſeeing it were unreaſonable to thinke that in ſuch caſes people ſhould neglect the counſell and conſent of the Mi- niſters of their owne Church. He doth therefore by this plaine teſtimony juſtifye our courſe in the calling of Miniſters, by how much we doe not proceed therein with-

without taking along with us the advise and approbation of the Classis, that is, of the Pastours of neighbour Churches.

Forasmuch as we may easily discerne from that which hath bene hitherto sayd in this Section, what the judgement of the chiefe of the *Lutheranes* is in this controversy, and what small credit is to be given unto Mr Cannes allegations and affirmations touching the consent of others with him in these matters of difference betwixt us; it may suffice to have examined the testimonies of these Authors, whose words he hath set downe; and for the rest, to judge of them according to the profession of their esteeme of those already mentioned, which are of chiefe note among them, and according to the publick Confessions of their Churches, of which we are to speak (l) hereafter, as also according to their generall practise. Concerning this it is testifyed by some of them here named (not to speak of other evidences) that they are so farre from including all Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction within the bounds of a particular Church, that their Churches are governed by *Ecclesiasticall Senates*, or *Consistories*, as they call them, *which are gathered out of three rankes of persons, Politicall, Ecclesiasticall, and Popular or Oeconomicall*; that *these Ecclesiasticall Consistories are appointed and directed by the authority of the chief Magistrate*; that *by these the Magistrate doth exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction and call Ministers*; that *the election of a Bishop or Superintendent which of old was performed by all the Bishops of the Province, in which a new Bishop was to be chosen, is now in well ordered Churches rightly performed in the Consistorie, where some principall Divines together with Politicall men, doe choose a Superintendent, who is confirmed by the assent and approbation of the chiefe Magistrate*. These are the assertions of *Mylius*, *Rungius*, *Osiander* and others, as they are cited and approved by (m) *Vestringius*, one of the same profession. Though these Authors doe not accord with us in divers of the foresaid expressions; yet Mr Canne had lesse cause to boast of their consent with him, seeing they agree in this, that their particular Churches are not independent bodies, but stand under Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves, holding that their Churches in this respect are well ordered. What trueth is there then in Mr Cannes words, when speaking of these men he saith, they *consent with us fully*? As for his jesting at the particular Churches, such as all the Reformed Churches are, in giving them a title of *noun-adjectives, that cannot stand without Classes and Synods*, it may be demanded of him, whether among all the Orthodoxe Churches in Europe at this day, there was ever heard of such a staggering *noun-substantive*, rent with so many scandalous Schismes, as is that Anti-Synodall Church of the Separation, whereof Mr Canne calles himself the Pastour. Let those that are wise consider of it.

(l) Sect. 7.

(m) Disc. Theol. de Potest. Eccl. th. 7. 10. 17. 18. arg. 10. &c.

Sect. III.

Touching the Testimonies of Calvinists.

THus Mr C. and W.B. doe (though as they say, for distinction sake, yet) unjustly call those Authours whom here they alledge: as if there were no other fit and convenient speech to describe *Godly and learned Ministers*, of whom I spake, but the name of Calvinists. Though it be lawfull to denominate men of their errours and Schismes wherein they stand against the Churches of God, and to call

call ſuch Sectaries by names taken from them that have bene their chief ringleaders, as the *Browniſts* of *Browne*, and the *Nicolaitans* of *Nicholas*; *Rev.* 2. 15. yet is there no warrant ſo to ſtile thoſe whom we doe not charge with the like errours and offences.

Mr Canne (a) after an idle and impertinent declaration of his owne ſurmiſe and imagination, that theſe Authors, *as he is perſwaded*, doe not teach the doctrine maintained by me, and after an unjuſt imputation which he implyes, as if I ſhould ſay, that *the whole Church (Officers and brethren) wants authority to performe in, and for itſelf, all Church-ſervices*; he comes to name his Authors, and alledges the words of foure of them, and telles that the reſt doe agree with them. His Authors are theſe, *P. Martyr, Iunius, Muſculus, Viret, Bullinger, Danæus, Gualter, Sybrandus, D. Mornæus, Morell, Tilenus, Baſtingius, Vrſinus, Piſcator, Calvine, Paræus, Keckerman, Hemmingius, Toſſanus, Polanus, Hyperius, Prædirius, Munſter, Oecolompadius, Beza, Bucer.*

(a) Chu.pl. P. 81.

Having cited theſe witneſſes to appeare for him, he then beginnes to inſult and glory, ſaying, (b) *And now* Mr Paget *what thinke you of theſe men? were they not* learned and godly Miniſters, Reverend and judicious Divines? *Are they not* authentick witneſſes? *If you confeſſe it; then marke what followes: viz. your poſition that* particular Congregations muſt ſtand under other Eccleſiaſticall authoritie out of themſelves, *is hence condemned, by a jurie of more then 24 men, of your owne chooſing, for an errour and untruth: The reaſon is; becauſe theſe affirme (I ſay all of them) that every particular Elderſhip, with the Churches conſent, may lawfully proceed among themſelves to the excommunicating of offenders, whenſoever there is neceſſary and juſt cauſe. Neither doe they ſay a word; that it is a* Divine inſtitution, *that the Miniſters of one Congregation, muſt firſt aſke the leave and conſent of other Miniſters, before they can lawfully adminiſter this ordinance of God.* Hereunto I anſwer; The more Reverend, Godly and learned theſe Authors were, the greater is his offence that ſhewes ſo little reverence unto them, in perverting and abuſing their teſtimonies. If any Advocate ſhould ſo farre wrong a *Iurie* of 24 men, as to falſify their verdict contrary to their meaning; might it not juſtly be counted a great forgery, and worthy of exemplary puniſhment? Now that this is the fault of Mr G. the Advocate and abettour of W. B. it may appeare in the firſt place, by the generall conſideration of their teſtimonies alledged. For though it be generally affirmed by theſe Authors, that matters of great weight, as excommunication, abſolution, chooſing of Miniſters and the like, are not to be adminiſtred without the common conſent of the Church; yet this proves not that it is unlawfull to ſeek the counſell and help of a Claſſis or Synod beforehand for the preventing of wrong, or that it is unlawfull to appeale unto them in caſe of wrong done. Though particular Congregations have power to judge, it followes not, that they themſelves are therefore ſubject to no other Eccleſiaſticall judgment out of themſelves. The errour & abſurdity of this conſequence may better appeare by theſe examples: Though fathers & maſters of particular families have immediate authority from God, & power to uſe it in a domeſticall way, to performe familie dueties, & judge of matters in the family; yet this hinders not but that their familie exerciſes & works may be judged of by other authority in the city, where many families are cõbined together for their mutuall governmẽt. Though particular cities

(b) Chu.pl. P. 83.

in and for themſelves have power to execute judgement, and to puniſh offences committed among them; yet this hinders not but that if they judge unjuſtly or abuſe their authority, that they themſelves may then be judged of others.

To come more particularly unto his Authors alledged, and firſt for *P. Martyr* whom he makes the foreman of the *Iurie*; though he writing againſt the errour of the Romiſh Church, teaching that Councels cannot erre, and preferring them above the Scriptures, have juſt cauſe to ſhew the errours of ſundry Councells and Synods, eſpecially about that time when ſo many wicked decrees were made by the Councell of *Trent*; yet he addeth, that (c) *theſe things were not ſpoken, that the Authority of Councels ſhould be wholly caſt away. For* (ſaith he) *if they reprehend, excommunicate or abſolve according to the word of God, praying together by the power of the Spirit, theſe ſhall not be in vaine nor without fruit.* And afterwards againe he brings (d) divine warrant to ſhew the inſtitution and order of Synods, from the example of the Apoſtles, *Act.* 15. By which it may appeare how he held that there was a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall power above particular Congregations, and conſequently that his teſtimony hath bene perverted by *Mr Came.*

(c) Loc. Cõm. Claſſ. 4. c. 4. § 11 de Cõncill

(d) Ibid. c. 6. § 18.

The ſecond Author alledged againſt us is *Iunius*, who notwithſtanding is a moſt pregnant witneſſe for us, to ſhew the authority of Synods. When Bellarmine objecteth againſt the Proteſtants, that they reject Eccleſiaſticall judgements, and refuſe the authority of Synods; this he (e) ſhewes to be moſt falſe. And further (f) he avoucheth both the juſt authority and neceſſity of Synods, and likewiſe the divine inſtitution of them, alledging often to that end beſides other Scriptures, that ſentence of the Apoſtle, 1. *Cor.* 14. 32. *The ſpirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets.* Though no ſentence, whether of a particular Congregation, or of any other judge, is to be yeelded unto and allowed contrary to the word of God; yet according to that word he (g) maintaineth that Synods are not onely to make inquiſition and to conſult, but that they alſo have under Chriſt a miniſteriall judgement touching the controverſies either about faith or manners. *Iunius* therefore is greatly abuſed when it is pretended that he hath brought in a contrary verdict againſt us.

(e) Anim. adv. in Bell. Controv. 4. de Conc. in Præf. n. 1, 2, 11, 12, 13.

(f) Ibid. l. 1 c. 1. & 3. & 10. n. 1, 2. & 11. n. 1.

(g) Ibid. c. 18. n. 1, 8. & l. 2. c. 1. n 1. & c. 16. n 1. & c. 18. n 1, 2, 6,

The third man of the *Iurie*, produced againſt us, is *Muſculus*. And here it is to be obſerved; 1. That it is untruely affirmed by him in his words noted before, touching the *Iurie* of more then 24 men, that they are *of mine owne* chooſing. For though I have a multitude of witneſſes agreeing with me; yet as none in particular were named by me; ſo *Muſculus* in ſpeciall ſhould not have bene alledged, conſidering his different judgement and practiſe from other Reformed Churches. For although he confeſſe that the power of election and depoſition of Miniſters, excommunication, &c. was exerciſed with conſent of the people in the primitive Church and in the Apoſtles time: yet he ſaith, and that (h) often, that this order was to be kept while there were no Chriſtian Magiſtrates; and that the order which was then profitable to the Churches, is not ſo at this time; that it now belongs unto the Magiſtrate to appoynt Miniſters, either by chooſing them himſelf, or confirming ſuch as were choſen by others at his commandement; that the Rule of *Telling the Church*, *Matth.* 18. was in force while they were deſtitute of Chri-

(h) Loc. Cõm. de Miniſt. p. 199, 204. de Eccl. p. 311 de Magiſt. p. 631, 632, & 633.

Christian Magistrates. 11. Though Musculus differ from other Reformed Churches in this question of Church-government; yet he also most evidently (even more then I doe) condemnes the opinion of the Brownists and of my opposites, while he (i) maintaines that particular Congregations are subject to another superiour power out of themselves in matters of Church-government; while he justifieth the practise of the Churches in *Berne*, where Ministers are chosen in the citie, and by the Senate sent unto the Churches in the country subject unto their jurisdiction, as they thought best. If *Musculus* had bene of *Mr Cannes & W. Bests* minde, he should have forsaken those Churches and separated from them, as not being a free people, while they wanted excommunication & power of choosing their owne Ministers. Who sees not here how notably they pervert the Authors alledged by them? Come we to the rest.

(i) Ibid. de elect. Minist. p. 200.

In the next place he nameth *Viret*, but it seemes he is mistaken in his Allegation, there being no such booke of *Viret*, as he hath quoted in his margine; he rather seemes to meane *Virell* in the *grounds of Religion*: But whether he meane *Viret* or *Virell*, neither of them can be justly alledged for his witnesses in this cause.

For *Viret*, he is (k) recorded to have bene a speciall assistant unto *Calvine* in the work of the Lord, for the settling of that forme of Discipline, by which the power of an Ecclesiasticall Judicatorie over divers particular Congregations, was established at *Geneva*. That *weed of Ecclesiasticall government by Classes and Synods* (as Mr Canne here (l) calles it) was planted by the hand of *Viret*, as well as of *Calvine*. And then what reason is there to judge but that *Viret* did esteeme it a plant of the heavenly Father, not to be rooted out of the garde of his Church, seeing he joyned with him in that work?

(k) Beza, in vita Calv. & Calv. Epist. 25, 39, 54, &c.

(l) Ch. pl. p. 94.

For *Virell*, he writes touching the outward calling of Ministers in the (m) place alledged, that it is *the lawfull choyse of a visible Church met together in the name of Christ*; that there be three things required thereunto; *first, that there be a search and tryall both of the conversation and learning of him that is to be chosen, &c. Another is this, that men come not to it by any corruptiō of gifts; but that it be free: so as they that have the power to chose, should have onely the glory of God, and the edification of his Church before their eyes. Thirdly, that he which is chosen have a Church appointed unto him for the execution of his office, whose duety it is to looke unto it diligently & carefully*. And more then this he saith not that can with any colour be thought to looke towards this cōtroversy. And in all this, what one word hath he against the authority of Synods? Nay it is the work of Classes and Synods to see that all things here required, be accordingly performed in particular Churches; and if any of these be omitted, to correct and reforme the same.

(m) Groūds of Relig. b. 3. c. 1. p. 2. 707, 708. edit. 12.

Bullinger, next alledged, though he say that the Church hath power to elect & ordaine fit Ministers, yet he was not of Mr Cannes minde, to thinke that the Church looseth her right, and is bereaved of her due power, when it is not exercised by herself alone, or in that popular way which he requireth: for even in the place (n) which Mr Canne hath cited, he saith, *It skilleth not much whether fit Ministers be ordained by grave men chosen by the Church, or by the whole Church it self, and that either by votes or by lots, or in any other convenient and holy manner. For godlinesse doth not*

(n) Decad. 5. Ser. 4.

contend about these things, so that all be done holily and according to order. And afterwards againe he speakes to the same purpose: *It is well knowne that true Churches have the right of ordaining Pastours, whether it be done by the votes of the whole Church, or by the lawfull judgement of them that be chosen by the Church.* It appeares by these & the following words that he alludes unto the practise of the Helvetian Churches, concerning which we are to make further mention (o) hereafter, when we come to speak of their Confession. Touching the Ecclesiasticall power of Synods, Bullinger declares his judgement also in this same booke, when (p) speaking of the power of the Church in judging of doctrines he gives instance in the gathering of a Synod, which saith he, the Church of God doth *according to the power receyved from the Lord, even as we read in the Actes of the Apostles, that the Apostles of the Lord have done, &c.* Againe he (q) cites and approves the decree of Justinian the Emperour, for the yearely celebrating of Synods, *where matters arising might be examined and by due correction healed.* He urgeth this decree against the Bishops, and warnes the Magistrates to take heed they doe not connive at the others negligence, *to the destruction of the whole Church and of all the Ministers of Christ.* Behold here the difference betwixt *Bullinger* and *Mr Canne*; that which the one holds to be the soveraigne remedy to preserve the safety of Churches & of the ministery, the other rejects as an unprofitable weed, and that which tends to the undoing and (r) spoyling of Churches.

(o) Sect. 7.

(p) Decad. 5. Ser. 1.

(q) Decad. 5. Serm. 10.

(r) Ch. pl. P. 74.

Danæus his testimony is likewise unjustly alledged against us, seeing he speakes not in the place mentioned, of the point in controversy betwixt us, viz. the authority of Classes & Synods, or the totall excluding of the same in those things which belong unto elections. Onely he doth there (f) reproove the grosse errour of those that in regard of such popular circumstances as Mr Canne seemes most to plead for, doe bring, as he saith, a very great confusion into the Church, by asscribing unto the people more then is due unto them: while he shewes that the electing and presenting of the person that is to be called unto any Ecclesiasticall office, whereby he understands the first taking notice of him, the examining of his life & doctrine, and the publishing or propounding of him unto the whole Church, that this belongs unto the Presbytery; and that the approving and accepting of the person so examined and propounded doth belong unto the people, they also having a convenient time allowed unto them, that if there be just cause they may testify their dislike and bring in their exceptions against him. This is the course there described and maintained by *Danæus*, and the same with that which is practised in our Church: And thus the Witnesses produced against us, doe still declare their consent with us. As for the authority of Synods and the divine right by which it is due unto them, *Danæus* gives his verdict, when in the exposition of the fourth commandement, having spoken of the jurisdiction and power of the Church, he saith, (t) *Here comes in the Question concerning Synods, which if they be right and keep themselves within their owne bounds, their authority is ordained by this Commandement.*

(f) In. 1. Tim. 5. 22.

(t) Ethic. Christ. Lib. 2. cap. 10.

Gualter in the (v) first place alledged, having spoken of the *due suffrages* or voices of the Church in elections, to prevent such a construction as Mr Canne seemes

(v) Homil. in Act. 13. 2

to

to make of his words, addes presently, *This place doth clearly teach that some parts are committed to the Church in this businesse.* And againe he saith there, that *the election of Ministers doth in some part belong to the Church, &c.* He doth not therefore exclude that part which herein we ascribe unto the Classis, by proceeding with their advise and consent. In the other (x) place (for Mr Cannes marginall quotation [13. 22.] seemes to be misprinted) he saith that by χειροτονία may be understood not onely the gathering of voices, but also imposition of hands, and in his opinion the latter acception doth agree best. *For*, saith he, *it is not likely that the Apostles would depart from the first order or course which we have seen to have bene observed in the election of Matthias, &c.* And upon *Act.* 1. 26. he labours to prove that this manner of chooſing is still to be observed in the Church, as *most safe and convenient*, whereby certaine men being found that are esteemed meet for the office unto which the election is to be made, *the event of our counsels may be referred unto the judgment of God*, by casting lots; in such sort as Matthias was chosen unto the Apostleship. However, that he doth not deny the matters of particular Congregations to be subject unto the judgement of the Ministers of other Churches, assembled in a Classis or Synod, may be gathered from those testimonies which evē in this booke here alledged, he gives concerning the authority of Synods, and the Divine warrant upon which it is grounded. Speaking of the authority of a Generall Councell which many then so much desired, he sayth, (y) *To me also it seemes to be a most profitable thing, if a free Synod could be obtained, in which all controversies might be composed out of the word of God alone: such as that Apostolicall [Synod] was, of which we are to speak in chap.* 15. *and such as we know those of old to have bene, viz. of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and the like, &c.* And afterwards againe, (z) intreating of Pauls sending from Miletus to Ephesus, and calling the Elders of the Church, he calles it a Synod: *By which example*, he saith, *as the faithfulnes and industrie of Paul doth appeare, so also we are admonished that the assemblies of Ministers are altogether necessary, in which Church-affaires may be handled by the common voyces of all. This makes greatly for the maintaining of Church-discipline, for the restraining of the ambition of Church-governours, for the preserving of consent in true doctrine, and for the repressing of heresies, which (if Ministers doe not most faithfully joyne their paines together) are wont often to creep in.* This he declares againe by the example of that Synod, *Act.* 15, and he commends the pietie and prudence of *Constantine the great*, for his frequent assembling of Synods; as on the other side he notes the wickednes of *Licinius* and of *Antichrist*, in resisting and hindring the due exercise of this *authority of Synods*. How doe these things agree with Mr Cannes discourse, who yet alledgeth this Author, as one of the Jurie, by which he saith my position (as he calles it) is condemned; viz. that particular Congregations must stand under other Ecclesiasticall authoritie out of themselves?

(x) Ibid. in cap. 14. 23.

(y) Ibid. in cap. 5. 21.

(z) Ibid. in cap. 20. 17.

Touching *Sibrandus*, the order of electing Ministers in these Churches (a) approved by him, is the same that is used in our Church, and approved by me also: and he hath notably perverted it in opposing of it unto me. For that order hinders not but that there may be another superiour Ecclesiasticall authority in a Classis or Synod, to judge of the elections made in particular Congregations, or of other con-

(a) Sibrād. Lubb. Resp. ad Pier. H. Gr. p. 159.

controverſies. This trueth is ſo often and ſo earneſtly avouched by *Sibrandus*, that ſcarſely any have bene more vehement in this poynt. And in this very book alledged, he in his firſt entrance, in the preface to the Senate of *Gelderland*, complaines of *Grotius* for oppugning this order of Claſſes and Synods; and in the concluſion of his preface he profeſſeth that there was ſcarſely any other meanes then a Nationall Synod to heale the evills of that time, and deſires them to perſwade the calling thereof. Afterward in the (b) book itſelf he ſhewes at large both from the Scriptures and practiſe of ancient Churches, the uſe, the order, and the authority of Synods; not onely in deliberating, but in judging and deciding of controverſies. In his Diſputation with *Bertius* he ſhewes (c) that it is *altogether needfull to have a Synodicall judgement to heale the wounds of the Church.* In his book againſt *Vorſtius*, after long diſpute, (d) in concluſion he offereth, yea he provoketh and urgeth him to referre their controverſy and differences to the judgement of other Churches, which he there nominates. And in the preface thereof unto the States Generall of the United Provinces, he ſhewes from the word of God and examples of the godly, the neceſſity of Synods, he declares what confuſion and diſtraction of Churches enſueth where they are neglected, and makes earneſt ſupplication unto them for the maintenance of this order in government. In another of his bookes againſt *Vorſtius*, (e) both in the beginning, middle, and end of it, he harpes upon the ſame ſtring. His appeale unto the judgement of other Churches, and his willingnes to ſubmit unto their judgement, with his deſire of a Nationall Synod, is plainely declared therein. Speaking of the fruit of Synods, he ſaith (f) that the holding of them in their Churches, *hath bene next unto God the chief ſinew of preſerving both the true doctrine and tranquillity of the Churches:* and that *if any man acquainted with their affaires dare deny the ſame, he ſhall manifeſt his impudency or make warre with his owne conſcience.* And thus by the verdict of *Sibrandus*, if my oppoſites underſtand the Diſcipline and ſtate of theſe Churches, and deny the fruit of Synods, they muſt be held for impudent and unconſcionable perſons. Moreover in his book againſt *Bellarmine* concerning *Councells* he gives divers teſtimonies (g) touching the profitable uſe of Councels for the determining of controverſies, their Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, and the exerciſe of it in making decrees and cenſuring offendours. By all which it appeares how injurious Mr Canne hath bene unto *Sibrandus* in producing him as a witneſſe againſt the authority of Synods, whereas he hath ſo often teſtifyed his judgement to the contrary.

Mornæus in the place (h) alledged, hath no ſuch thing as for which he is quoted; unleſſe he meane that which is noted in one of the following pages, (i) that the Popes of Rome were choſen in publick aſſemblies *of the Prieſts, the Nobility, the common people, the Senate, by the voices of all, &c.* which if it be explained and applyed to the queſtion in hand, may eaſily be diſcerned to fall ſhort of proving any thing againſt us. But this Author in the ſame booke ſhewes plainly his approbation of Synods for the judgement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes: He alledgeth frequently and maintaines againſt *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* the judiciall Acts and ſentences of ſundry Synods againſt the Popes of Rome. He calles thoſe decrees of the Councell of Baſile, (k) *Catholick* or univerſall *trueths*, whereby it was enacted; 1. *That the*

(b) P. 140, 141, &c.

(c) Epiſt. Diſcept. de Fide. p. 3.

(d) Declar. Reſp. Conr. Vorſt. p. 142, 143, 144.

(e) Cõment. ad 99 Erro. res C. Vorſt. pref. p. 45, Cõm. p. 503 504. & p. 841.

(f) Ibid. pref. p. 34, 35.

(g) De Cõc. Lib. 1. c. 1. & l. 2. c. 3. & l. 5. c. 1, 3, 5, 8.

(h) Hiſtor. Pap. p. 542, &c. edit. 1612.

(i) Ib. p. 545

(k) P. 1218.

the power of a Generall Councell, representing the whole Church is above the Pope and everie other person. 2. That the Pope cannot dissolve a Generall Counsell without their consent, &c. 3. That he that doth obstinately oppose the foresaid trueths is to be accounted an Heretick. He relates & cōmends the speeches of (l) *Marsilius Patavinus*, (m) *Petrus de Alliaco*, and divers others, shewing the power of Councels in judging and censuring the Pope, the necessity of them, both Provinciall and Generall, for the correcting of abuses, and amending of all sorts of persons and things with greater authority. He approves and defends (n) the renowned Italian Martyr, *Hieronimus Savanorola*, for seeking that a Generall Councell might be called for reformation of the Clergie, and degenerate estate of the Church, &c. Besides this, he being in his time a principall favourer & maintainer of the Discipline in the French Churches, where the causes of particular Congregations were judged and determined by Synods, could therefore be no favourer of the Brownists opinion, which count such government to be a miserable bondage and slavery of the Churches.

(l) P. 1010, &c.
(m) P. 1232 &c.
(n) P. 1341.

Tilenus, that is also called to be one of their Jurie against me, doth most expresly give his verdict on my side against the Brownists. He teacheth (o) that the fourefold power of the Church is to be exercised not onely in Presbyteries, but also in Councels or Synods: that (p) Synods according to the power granted of God unto his Church, may take knowledge of Ecclesiasticall causes, and by their judgements conferred together according to the word of God, may define, &c. & (q) give ministeriall sentence, &c. And further he saith, (r) *As it is not to be hoped for that the body of the Church militant on earth shall be free from divers diseases; so we may not think that it can want this remedy of Synods, which we therefore affirme to be not onely lawfull but also necessary.*

(o) Syntag. Disp. Theol. par. 2. Disp. 30. thes. 1.
(p) Thes. 4.
(q) Th. 19.
(r) Th. 38.

Bastingius shewing how *Excommunication pertaineth to the whole Church*, saith nothing but that which is practised both in our and other Reformed Churches of these countries, especially if it be marked how he explaines himself in the leafe following, where he addes that (f) *Ecclesiasticall discipline and excommunication itself ought to be administred by them who are ordained thereunto of the Church; such as are Ministers of the Word, and Elders, the rest of the Church consenting thereunto; yet with this correction, that the multitude of the people doe not rule the action, but provide as watchmen, that nothing be done by a few as they list themselves.* Besides, he being a member & Minister of these Churches, and Regent of a Colledge in *Leyden*, there is no reason from these his words to conclude against the authority of Synods in judging the causes of particular Congregations, if they either could not agree among themselves, or should agree in evill. For then he should have condemned his owne estate and practise, which yet cannot be inferred from this his testimony.

(f) Expos. Catech. Qu. 85.

Vrsinus also, though he teach that *the unrepentant are to be excommunicated by the common consent of the Church, &c.* yet doth he not thereby deny or exclude the power of Synods in judging of that which is done in particular Congregations; but doth plainly give testimony with me. For (t) having shewed the conditions and necessity of Synods, he saith of them, *This remedie for the healing of the wounds of the Church is not to be neglected, which the holy Ghost hath shewed unto us, by the counsell and example of the Apostles; which all reason of divine and humane right requires;*

(t) Tom. 2. Admo. Chr. de lib. Concord. c. 12. col. 686.

which

which being lawfully used experience hath proved to be most wholesome for the Church in many most grievous confusions of opinions. Neither was this his private opinion, but (v) written in the name of other Divines & Ministers in the jurisdiction of Prince *Casimir*, and approved by them.

(v) Ibid. Tit. & Col. 478.

Piscator saith, Excommunication is a decree of the Church, & therefore ought to be done of the Church, (x) *or of the Eldership judging in the name of the Church.* We grant as much or more in the practise of our Church, while the Eldership never exerciseth such power alone, without the knowledge and consent of the Church, by propounding the same divers times unto them. But it is a perverting of this testimony, to gather from hence that the actions of the Church or Eldership are not subject to the judgement of Synods, if they be complained of for wrong. And that *Piscator* alloweth the authority of Synods, (y) *to judge the controversies of Religion*, *and to* (z) *make decrees by gathering of voyces in order*, it is evident from other of his writings.

(x) In 1. Cor. 5. Obs. 1. Art. 3.

(y) In Act. 15. Obser. in v. 6.

(z) Thes. Theol. Vol. 1. Loc. 23. de Eccl. th. 68. & 72.

Calvine requiring the (a) cognition of the whole Church before any be excommunicate, requires no more then is held and practised by us. And this is no empeachment to his and our opinion with him, that in case of doubt or controversy, (b) *there is no better nor more certaine remedie then that a Synod of true Bishops meet together, where the controversy may be discussed. For such a definition shall have much more weight, where the Pastours of Churches in common doe agree together, &c.* And this he there confirmes both by Scripture, and sundry examples of ancient Churches, shewing that *from the beginning it was the ordinary way of preserving unitie in the Church, so often as Satan began to attempt any thing.* Besides this, not to speak of other testimonies afforded by Calvine to this purpose, when as Mr Canne (c) afterward notes the assertions of divers pleading for the Hierarchie of Bishops, and oppugning Ecclesiasticall government by Classes and Synods, as a weed of later growth, saying that *at Geneva subjecting of Churches first began. And before* Calvine *came there, everie Congregation was free in itself.* If these assertions be true, and that none is able to disprove them, as Mr Canne there supposeth, how comes it that he thus perverteth *Mr Calvines* testimony against his profession and practise? Let the Reader observe that if these assertions were sound, Mr Canne might as well have written a booke, to prove the miserable bondage and slavery of the Church at Geneva, procured by the tyrannicall government and corrupt doctrine of *Mr Calvine*, as he wrote the like title of an unjust complaint upon the like ground against me.

(a) Instit. l. 4. c. 1. § 15.

(b) Ibid. c. 9. § 13.

(c) Ch. pl. p. 94.

Paræus on 1. Cor. 5. 5. doth thus interpret the words; *Let such a one be delivered to Satan; to wit, by the Church, or by the Pastours and Elders of the Church, which are the mouth of the Church. For by these the Church speaketh and dealeth. Without this order there would be confusion, if in a publick action every one might speake and deale: which undoubtedly the Apostle would not bring in.* This we grant, and it is not against us, but against the confused practise of the Brownists. But for the poynt in hand, that Classes and Synods have power to judge of the actions of particular Congregations, *Paræus* is a plaine witnesse for us in (d) other of his writings. And againe, speaking of a lawfull Synod and the authority thereof in deciding of controversies in the Church, he saith that therein (e) *men renowmed in regard of their learning, understanding*

(d) Colleg. Theol. Decur. Coll. 9. Disp. 8. Auctar. 1. & Co. 10. Disp. 22. th. 1--10. & Disp. 24. th. 9.

(e) Eirenic. cap. 5.

ding and piety, whether they be of the Laity or Clergy, have not onely a voice of deliberation and counsell, but also of judgement and power of defining. And hereunto accordes his (f) Epistle written unto the Nationall Synod holden last at Dort, wherein excusing his absence, that he could not come in respect of his age, as he much desired, yet he shewes his approbation of such a meeting, as being *the ordinary medicine for healing the wounds of the Church*, and rejoyceth greatly in the spirit for the benefit expected from that Synod, which judged & censured the errours of particular men in divers Churches. What reason then had Mr Canne thus to abuse the words of *Paræus* against his meaning and publick profession?

(f) Act. Syn. Nat. Dordr. Sess. 58.

Keckerman also agreeth with the former witnesses touching the poynt in controversy. For in the book alledged by Mr Canne, when as the parts of the government of the Church are there described; he shewes that (g) the convocation of Synods belongeth unto Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, and is contained under the same.

(g) System. Theo. l. 3. c. 6. p. 401, 402.

Hemmingius, though more sound and moderate then other Lutherans, yet being a disciple and follower of *Melanthon*, there was no reason why he should not have bene joyned with his Master in the foregoing ranke of Testimonies, if Mr Canne had either knowne his Authour, or regarded the order which he had set downe to himself. But for his judgement touching the jurisdiction of Synods, he hath witnessed his consent with the Writers mentioned both in this & the former Section, and testifyed against Mr Canne in this cause. For speaking of that part of Ecclesiasticall Discipline, unto which he referres the deposition and excommunication of Ministers, he commends the order of the ancient Church, where he saith (h) *the execution of this discipline was chiefly committed to the Bishops, who therefore sometimes twise, sometimes oftner in the yeare called Provinciall Synods, where the matter was handled, not by the censure of one Bishop, but by the sentence of the whole Clergy assembled.*

(h) Enchir. Theo. Class. 3. c. 11.

Tossanus, mentioned in the next place, hath plainely declared himself to be of the same minde with us, in allowing Synodall and Classicall assemblies to judge & determine the causes of particular Churches and persons. He (i) maintaines against *Thyræus* that which he had formerly written, in these words, *In controversies of religion we appeale from Luther, and from the censures and judgements of private men, unto the judgement of the Catholick Church and of a Synod.* He proves this to be sound and orthodoxe from the Apostles referring the decision of the controversie concerning Iustification and the Ceremonies of the Law, unto the *Councell at Ierusalem*, *Act.* 15. Speaking of somewhat that was wanting in most of the German Churches, about the ordaining of Ministers, he saith that (k) *godly Pastours and Overseers doe dayly bewaile the scarsitie of faithfull labourers, and that the Presbyteries and well ordered Ecclesiasticall Senates doe indeavour that both in Synods and yearely visitations, and in Classicall meetings the failings of Ministers may be amended according to their power.* In which words he hath reference unto the practise of the Churches in the Palatinate (concerning which we are to speake (l) hereafter) where he joyned with them in the exercise of the sayd government, being (m) at *Neustads* a moderator of the Ecclesiasticall counsels of the Consistory, and sometime also President of a Synod; and

(i) Pastor. Evang. p. 61 edit. 1603.

(k) P. 49.

(l) Sect. 7.

(m) D. Toss. Vita, p. 38.

(n) Ib. P. 44. afterwards at *Heidelberg* (n) a member of the Eccleſiaſticall Senate. How unjuſtly therefore & untruely hath Mr Canne dealt with *Toſſanus* and his readers, in reckoning him among thoſe who, as he ſaith, (o) have condemned for an errour & untrueth, that poſition touching particular Congregations ſtanding under other Eccleſiaſticall authoritie out of themſelves!

(o) Ch. pl. p. 83.

As for *Polanus*, to grant Mr Canne, that he was of the ſame minde with the former Authours, touching the Churches power in excommunicating, though ſo much can hardly be manifeſted out of the (p) place alledged; yet what is that to our queſtion? The Churches power in excommunicating doth not exclude the authority of Synods in judging of a particular Congregation. *Polanus* ſpeaking of Synods, expreſſely confeſſeth, that (q) *the liberty or power of thoſe Eccleſiaſticall aſſemblies is a right given of God unto his Church, &c.* that *An Eccleſiaſticall Synod is a publick aſſemblie of godly men, lawfully ſent and gathered together from divers Churches, alſo of divers Provinces, that they may handle and determine according to the power that is granted unto them of God, touching holy affaires, &c.* He alledgeth ſundry Scriptures and examples of the Ancient Churches for declaration hereof. And againe in the ſame place, he notes it for a condition of a lawfull Synod, that thoſe which are choſen and deputed of the Churches may have a *deliberative* or conſulting, and alſo a *deciding* voyce or giving of ſentence, &c. When he requires another condition of a lawfull Synod, that *every one may have free acceſſe and receſſe*; yet he addes this withall, that *whoſoever is convicted of hereſy or any crime, and remaineth obſtinate, ſhould undergoe Eccleſiaſticall cenſure, that is, depoſition from his Eccleſiaſticall office, or Suſpenſion, or Excommunication.* And to like purpoſe he writes in (r) other places. This being the judgement of *Polanus* touching the authority of Synods, how uncircumſpect was W. Beſt & his abettour, to call for a *Iurie* of ſuch Divines as have given ſuch pregnant ſentence and ſo peremptory verdict againſt them?

(p) Synt. Theol. l. 7. c. 18.

(q) Ib. c. 14

(r) Ib. c. 16. Syllo. Theſ. Theol. par. 1 de Concil.

Hyperius, next alledged, though he deny not the power of particular Congregations, yet in his writings it is evident that he holdes the power of Synods, conſiſting of the Deputies of many Churches, to be a ſuperiour power above one particular Church, and that they may judge of the affaires thereof and of the perſons therein, either Miniſters or people. This he declares at large in a peculiar treatiſe touching *yearely Synods*, (t) wherein after he had ſhewed the neceſſity and uſe of Synods by many divine and humane teſtimonies, he then deſcribes their power, not for counſell onely, as the Browniſts and my oppoſites doe, but for the exerciſe of all kinde of Eccleſiaſticall cenſures, as Rebukes of offenders, Suſpenſion, Excommunication, and Depoſition or deportment of Officers from their miniſtery. Of all the men of the *Iurie* before mentioned, there is none that gives a more full and cleare verdict againſt Mr Canne, then this *Hyperius* doth.

(t) De Syno. Annuis Opuſc. Theol. p. 768-870. Baſ. 1570.

Oecolompadius, another of his Authors, hath declared his judgement touching Synods, and the authority exerciſed in them, to be ſuch as argues his teſtimony alledged by Mr Canne to be perverted, while it is produced againſt the ſame. For in his anſwer to *Luther*, inſerted among the workes of Zuinglius, (t) he doth highly commend the Councell of *Nice*, and ſpecially for *decreeing* that none ſhould afterwards attempt to adde any new articles unto that Confeſſiō of faith which they had

(t) Tom. 2. fol. 491.

had set downe. Which *Nestorius* being found guilty of, *Oecolompadius* approves of that Act of the Councell of *Ephesus*, whereby he was excommunicated, saying, *For which cause being condemned of the crime of heresie, he was by common consent shut out of the Church, which was sensible of peace restored unto her by this meanes.* Hereby it appeareth that he acknowledged Ecclesiasticall jurisdictiō & censure to be a power due unto Synods, and that which may lawfully be exercised by them.

Beza, next alledged, upon 2. *Thes.* 3. 14. though he there call Excommunication, *an Ecclesiasticall judgement*, yet doth he not thereby infringe the authority of Classes and Synods, neither can any such thing by any just consequence be gathered from his Annotations on that place. But on the other side he shewes (v) elswhere that Synods have their Ecclesiasticall judgements grounded upon the word of God, and a profitable use in the Church of God; and that the fanaticall opinion of *Morellius* (much like unto the Brownists) hath bene worthily condemned in many Synods. And according to his writing, so was his practise; both at *Geneva*, where he was one of them that had their voyce in the government of that Church by a joynt Presbytery or Classis; and in France, where he himself was President of that famous (x) Synod at *Rochell*, where the Confession of their faith was subscribed by divers Princes, and many Ministers and Elders assembled together. And therefore if Mr Canne and W. Best their accusation of me were sound and just, they might as well complaine of *Beza*, for bringing the Churches of God into *miserable slavery and bondage* by his tyrannicall government and corrupt doctrine.

(v) Epist. 83. De Ministr. gradib. c. 23 p. 155. & c. 24. p. 176. 177.

(x) Harmo. Confes. p. 112. edit. 1612.

Bucer, last alledged, accordes with the foregoing Authors, and his words in commendation of Synods may serve to close up this kinde of Testimonies, being an advise unto King Edward the Sixt, for the constant celebrating of them. In his Admonition given to the King for the restitution of the Kingdome of Christ in his dominions, amidst other wholesome counsels out of the word of God, he saith, (y) *It shall be the duety of the Bishops of each Province to celebrate two Synods every yeare, as it is ordained by so many Canons, and Lawes of godly Emperours. At which Synods must be assembled and heard, not onely the Bishops of the Cities, but also inferiour Bishops and other Presbyters and Deacons, that are endued with a larger measure of knowledge and zeale for the kingdome of Christ: that so the more effectually both the faults crept into the Church may be corrected, and the pietie of all repaired.* He had also spoken before of other inferiour and more frequent assemblies, like unto our Classes, requiring that all the Ministers within the compasse of about 20 Parishes, should often meet together, for their mutuall assistance in removing offences & advancing the kingdome of Christ. Touching Synods, he speakes also in (z) another place to the same purpose, approving the ancient constitution, whereby it was ordained that *the Bishops of every Province should assemble together with the Presbyters and Deacons, as often as the need of the Churches should require, but without faile twise in the yeare; that they might inquire concerning the doctrine and discipline of Christ, how it were administred and did flourish in severall Churches; that where any default was discovered they might correct it; and where they found things in good state, they might confirme and promote the same.* By that *correction* spoken of here and in the former testimonie, he understands not onely counsell

(y) De Regno Christi. Lib. 2. c. 12.

(z) De vi & usu S. Min. tit. de Disci. Cler. Opusc. f. 582.

and admonition, but the judiciall exercise of authority in Ecclesiasticall censures: For he doth plainly distinguish betwixt *admonition* and *correction*, when in the following words concerning Metropolitanes he saith, *If any thing were done amisse by the Ministers of the Churches, or by the common people, which by their admonitions they could not amend, that then for the correcting of it they should call a* Synod of Bishops: *for there was no* [power] *of judgement allowed unto them, which by their owne authority they might exercise in the Churches, &c.* Thus *Bucerus* also, as well as the former, hath condemned Mr Cannes position, viz. that particular Congregations must not stand under other Ecclesiasticall authoritie out of themselves.

And these are all the Authors here alledged by Mr Canne, except onely *Morell*, *Prædirius* and *Munster*, either not seen at all, nor to be procured for the present, as the two former; or not seen to touch this controversie in the writings at hand, as the latter.

Having now heard what these chosen men of the *Iurie*, all nominated by W. B. his Advocate, have testifyed concerning Classes or Synods; let the Reader judge whether they have given verdict for or against Synods: whether every one of these Authors alledged had not just cause (if they were living) to complaine of great abuse done to them in perverting their testimonies, and making false consequences from their words contrary to their meaning. And forasmuch as all these witnesses here examined are so farre from testifying ought against us, that they have on the other side witnessed the trueth of that which we maintaine against Mr Canne; hence it is evident that I had just cause to say that which he would seeme to disprove by alledging these Authors against me, viz. that there were *a multitude of learned and godly Ministers of the same judgement and practise with me*. For further proofe whereof it were easy (if need were) to produce another *Iurie* of approved Authors, more in number then those he hath specifyed, and not inferiour for learning and piety unto some of those that he hath named, all which in their severall writings, Common places, Commentaries and other Treatises, have in like manner as the former, described the use, the necessity and the authority of Synods, not onely for counsell, but for judgement and decision of controversies; divers of them alledging not onely examples of ancient Churches, but the holy Scriptures also for the warrant of that which they teach, and therefore shewing that they maintaine them lawfull *jure divino*; and that their tenure of them is from the grant that Christ hath given unto his Church. But the trueth of that assertion touching the *multitude* of those that consent with me, will most plainly appeare when we come to speak of the publick and generall testimonies of whole Churches & most solemne assemblies of learned & godly men, touching this controversie. In the meane while let us follow Mr Canne, according to his owne Method.

Sect. IV.

Touching the Testimonies of English Conformists.

IN the next place they proceed, and in an homely phrase, they say, *Touching the* English Conformists, *the formablest of them are for us, in this poynt.* And here they alledge *B. Whitgift*, *D. Bilson*, *Whitaker*, *Bell*, *Willet*, *and Taylor.*

Tou-

Touching theſe I anſwer: Firſt for B. *Whitgift*, though he confeſſe that *in the Apoſtles time the ſtate of the Church was popular, becauſe the Church had intereſt almoſt in every thing*; yet this proves not that he thought particular Congregations to be independent and uncontrolable by the Deputies of other Churches aſſembled in Synods. The ordinary practiſe of B. *Whitgift*, in judging the cauſes of other Congregations, ſhewed that he was farre from the meaning of the Browniſts in this poynt. His words are wreſted by an unjuſt conſequence to prove independency of Churches, and the undue power of Synods. See Def. ag. T. C. p. 180. 182.

For D. *Bilſon*, there is notable wrong done to him, in clipping his words, and defacing his teſtimonie, by omitting that which is moſt materiall in this controverſy. For when D. *Bilſon* had ſayd, (a) *Though the Preſbyters had more ſkill to judge, yet the people had as much right to chooſe their Paſtour; & if the moſt part of them did agree, they did carrie it from the Clergie*; Thus farre Mr Canne reciteth his words, but here in the midſt of the ſentence, before the period be ended, he breakes off and leaves out this exception that is added, viz. *ſo the perſons choſen were ſuch as the Canons did allow, and the ordainers could not juſtly miſlike.* In this exception D. B. acknowledgeth, that there may be juſt cauſe to diſanull the election of the people, if it be found worthy to be miſliked. And his meaning is yet more evident by the ſtory which in the ſentence immediately preceding he alledgeth out of (b) *Socrates*, touching the election of *Proclus*, who being choſen by the greater number was yet refuſed, becauſe the election was ſayd to be againſt the Canon of tranſlating Biſhops, and ſo the people were forced to hold their peace. That which is practiſed in theſe Reformed Churches, is in this poynt the very ſame thing that D. B. teſtifies of the Primitive Church: for Claſſes and Synods doe not uſe to impoſe or chooſe Miniſters. If particular Congregations doe chooſe a Miniſter, neither Claſſes nor Synods can diſanull the election, if there be no juſt cauſe of exception againſt the perſon elected. And if upon juſt exception the election be hindred yet then alſo is the new election of another permitted to the free choyſe of the particular Church; neither doth the Claſſis deprive them of their juſt power and liberty therein.

(a) Perpet. Gover. c. 15 p. 360.

(b) Lib. 7. cap. 35.

That it may more plainly appeare how unjuſtly and unreaſonably D. *Bilſon* is alledged as agreeing with my oppoſites, let it be further obſerved, that in his Diſpute againſt *Beza* & ſuch as approve the Diſcipline of theſe Reformed Churches, he doth not as my adverſaries, complaine of the *undue power* of Synods, that judge and determine the cauſes of particular Congregations. He acknowledgeth that (c) *the neceſſity and authority of Synods is not ſo much in queſtion betwixt us, as the perſons that ſhould aſſemble and moderate thoſe meetings, &c.* He would have (d) *Metropolitanes* to be the Moderatours and rulers of Synods: he would have (e) *lay-Elders* thruſt out from aſſembling with Miniſters in Synods: he complaines (f) of the *intolerable charges* and expences of having frequent Synods, &c. Herein he differs from us, and we from him. But that there is a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall authoritie in Synods, to decide the cauſes of particular Churches, which is the poynt in queſtion, herein he agreeth with us. He ſaith of ſuch Synods and their power to judge, as followeth. (g) Their warrant ſo to doe is builded on the maine grounds of all

(c) Perpet. Gover. c. 16 P. 370.
(d) P. 378. &c.
(e) P. 387. &c.
(f) P. 386. 387.
(g) P. 372.

„ divine and humane ſocieties, ſtrengthened by the promiſe of our Saviour, and „ aſſured unto them by the example of the Apoſtles and perpetuall practiſe of the (h) P. 374. Church of Chriſt. Afterwards he ſaith of their meetings in Synods; (h) This „ hath in all Ages, as well before, as ſince the great Councell of Nice bene ap- „ proved and practiſed, as the lawfulleſt and fitteſt meanes to diſcerne trueth from „ falſhood, to decide doubts, end ſtrifes, and redreſſe wrongs in cauſes Eccleſiaſti- „ call; yea when there were no beleeving Magiſtrates to aſſiſt the Church, this „ was the onely way to cleanſe the houſe of God, as much as might be, from the „ lothſome veſſels of diſhonour: and after Chriſtian Princes began to profeſſe & „ protect the trueth, they never had, nor can have any better or ſafer direction „ amongſt men, then by the Synods of wiſe and godly Paſtours. And many other things to like purpoſe are written by him, complayning that the denyall of this or- (i) P. 376. der is (i) *an heatheniſh, if not an helliſh confuſion, &c.*

That which they bring out of *Scultingius*, a Papiſt before alledged, is idle & impertinent: untill they heare me avouch ſuch things as he doth for change of the order of Chriſt, let them refraine their ſurmiſes and conjectures of imaginary arguments which they gueſſe that I will uſe.

Having brought ſuch Authours againſt me, mark how *Wil. B.* or *Io. Ca.* for him, (k) Chu. pl. p. 85. doth triumph againſt me before the victory; in theſe words, (k) *To ſay that this ſuperiour power of Claſſes and Synods, is* Jure Divino, *I thinke he will not any more doe it: there being in the Scriptures no proofe (yea I may boldly ſay) nor ſhew of any proofe for it.* I confeſſe indeed it is boldly ſpoken of him. for who ſo bold als blinde B.? But whether there be at leaſt ſhew of proofe in the Scriptures, for the ſuperiour authority of Synods in judging the cauſes of particular Congregations, let us ſee what his owne witneſſe ſaith.

D. Whitaker that is next alledged by him, doth by many arguments ſhew the (l) De Conc. qu. 1. c. 3. p. 15. 16. & q. 2. c. 3. p. 55, 56. profit and neceſſity of Synods; and to this end he citeth many (l) places of Scripture, both from the old & new Teſtament: he alledgeth at large (m) 7 or 8 cauſes for which they are profitable, and of great uſe and fruit. He ſpeaketh alſo of ſuch Synods as are not onely for diſcuſſing and concluding of matters by way of counſell and adviſe, but of thoſe that have power to (n) judge and condemne obſtinate offenders by a publick judgement, and as occaſion requires, to *anathematiſe* or exclude from the fellowſhip of the Church: he maintaines that thoſe which are lawfully called unto Synods, have authority of deciding and determining controverſies by (o) definitive ſentence or ſuffrage: he ſaith that (p) appeales are of divine and naturall right, and cannot be denyed in controverſies about Eccleſiaſticall cauſes and perſons. And thus by the teſtimony of their owne witneſſe my adverſaries doe offend both againſt the law of God, and the law of nature, in denying appeales, and in not allowing the actions and judgements of a particular Congregation to be judicially examined by a Synod or Claſſis. The ſeverall teſtimonies of *D. Whitaker* to this purpoſe, are alledged (q) before and applyed at large, to declare his judgement in this controverſy.

(m) P. 17, &c.
(n) P. 21.
(o) Ibid. q. 3. c. 3. p. 95. 96. &c.
(p) De Pōtif. Rom. qu. 4. p. 470.
(q) P. 39. & 133--141.
(r) De Cōc. q. 5. p. 178.

Though *D. Whit.* doe (r) grant (as is here alledged againſt me) that *Eccleſiaſticall authority is in the Church principally, primarily and eſſentially, &c.* he doth not here-

by

by contradict himself, or deny the power of Synods, where Ministers doe judge by vertue of their calling and deputation from many Churches. The authority of Churches is manifested in them, and by their service therein. The like testimony alledged from *Saravia* and *Schola Parisiensis* is (f) before answered. Yea the Schoole of *Paris* doth sufficiently (t) explaine this matter by a fit similitude, shewing that Ecclesiasticall authority is in the Church primarily, and instrumentally in the Ministers: as the power of seeing is in man principally, but instrumentally in the eye: As man sees by his eye, so the Church exerciseth Ecclesiasticall authority by the Ministers and rulers thereof; and so judgeth of all crimes and offences.

(f) P. 170.
(t) Schol. Paris. p 1, 2.

The testimony of *Bell* next alledged, is in like manner to be understood. Whereas from (v) him they object that *Excommunication precisely and chiefly pertaineth to the Church; and that she hath authority to commit the execution thereof to some speciall persons, for that purpose, and chosen for that end:* this doth no way condemne, but rather illustrate our practise agreeable thereunto. And that the meaning of this Authour was not repugnant unto us, it appeareth more plainely by another of his writings, (x) where he evidently declares his minde, that Synods have power to exercise Ecclesiasticall authority, and to proceed judicially with delinquents, even to *depose* & *excommunicate*, though it were the Pope himself, upon due conviction. And to this end he alledges the confession of many Popish writers, and farre more truely and uprightly then Mr Canne hath done in this controversie.

(v) Regim. of Chur. ch. 2. sect. 4.
(x) Bells motiv. l. 2. c. 4. concl. 3, &c.

As for *D. Willet*, if he speak but *to the same effect* with *Bell*, as they say, then the same answer may serve. But for the place alledged [*Synops. cont. 4. qu. 4. p. 2.*] I finde no such matter there. They alledge p. 2. when as there is no second part of that question. But in the same booke he gives plaine evidence against them; he acknowledgeth Synods to be (y) *an wholesome meanes for the repressing and reforming both of errours in religion and corruption in manners:* he alledgeth the consent of antiquity to prove that our opinion is grounded upon trueth and Scripture, namely that those which are lawfully called unto Synods, (z) have *determining voyces*, and power to *give sentence*; and giveth instance in the Councell of Antioch, where *Paulus Samosatenus* was condemned and *cut off* as an enemie to the trueth, &c. he avoucheth that (a) *they have authority to judge, examine, suspend, punish and depose, &c.* And thus *D. Willet* fully accordeth with us in this poynt, that there is a superiour power to judge the causes of particular Congregations.

(y) Synops. Papi. Cōt. 3. qu. 1, p. 105.
(z) Qu. 3. p. 109, 110.
(a) Qu. 7 p. 123.

D. Taylor next alledged, affords them no help. Whereas he saith, that (b) *Excommunication is the common action of the Church, and not of any private person or persons:* we also affirme the same thing. Our profession and practise alwayes hath bene, never to excommunicate any without common consent of our Church; but had we done unjustly at any time therein, we might justly have bene subject to the censure of a Synod or Classis: and yet then also the Ministers and Deputies assembled in the name of many Churches, could with no reason be accounted *private persons*. And though we think ourselves bound to ask counsell of the Classis, according to the order of these Churches, before we proceed to cut off any member of the Church by excommunication, this proves no deprivation but a direction of our power.

(b) Com. on Tit. 3. 10. p. 712.

Now

Now whether I have *just cause to blush for denying to the Churches of God that* due power *which the Learned of all professions doe grant unto her*, as Mr Canne and Will. Bdoe without blushing (c) charge me, let the judicious & impartiall Readers judge.

(c) Ch. pl. p. 86.

Sect. V.

Touching the Testimonies of English Non-conformists.

VNder the title of this kinde of witnesses, they alledge against me, the *Replyer to D. Downame*, *Mr Parker*, the Authour of the *English Puritanisme*, *D. Ames*, *Mr Baines*, *Mr Bates*, *Mr Fenner*, *Mr Udall*, *the English Church at Franckford*, *and Mr Hooker*. These are (d) here produced: and in another (e) place, unto which he referres us for the same purpose, he cites also *the Protestation of the Kings Supremacie*, *D. Fulke*, and *our Country-men in New-England*.

(d) Ch. pl. p. 86, &c.
(e) P. 23.

For answer hereunto; First, concerning some of these that seeme to be of Mr Cannes minde, in denying the authority of Synods in the government of the Church, observe how idlie and superfluously he alledgeth them against me; when as he knowes that I my self did acknowledge and note so much before, as namely the judgement of (f) *Mr Hooker*, (g) *D. Ames*, and the Author of the booke entitled *English Puritanisme*, by whom also the *Protestation of K. Supremacie* is sayd to be written. These I have confessed to be opposite unto me in this controversy, & have long since professed unto them how much I have disliked their opinions in this poynt.

(f) Answ. to W. B. p. 74.
(g) Ib. p. 27

Secondly, though these witnesses have testifyed their particular judgement, yet did they never deny but that they differed herein from many other godly Ministers in England, which desired a reformatiō of the Church as well as they. When as I expostulated with *D. Ames* long since, touching the publishing of that treatise of *English Puritanisme*, and complayned of wrong done unto many silenced Ministers, who did not hold such opinions as are contained in that booke; his excuse was that they did not affirme those to be the opinions of all, but onely of the *Rigidest sort of those that are called Puritanes*, and that so much was specifyed in the Title of that book. And againe in the preface of that book, those opinions are sayd to be *the worst that the worst of them hold*: and the persons that doe hold those peculiar opinions, are there againe distinguished from others by the title and name of *Rigid Presbyterians*. Now though these expressions be not without some offence, yet from hence it may appeare that the Authors and Publishers thereof were farre from that slanderous disposition of Mr Canne, in charging those of different opinion to have changed and altered their judgement; when as he saith, (h) *Time was when* Mr Paget *did esteeme them to be a multitude of godly and learned Ministers; and was (or at least made shew he was) of their judgement and practise.* An unconscionable insinuation against me. And afterwards againe he saith, (i) *Mr Paget hath left the way of Non-conformitie, yea and shewes himself to it a great adversary, &c.* A grosse slander. Whereas Mr Canne saith further touching the *Protestation of K. Supremacie*, that this booke was (k) *set out under the name of all the unconformable Ministers in the Realme*; this is a notable falshood: for neither is the word *All* used in the title of that Protesta-

(h) Chu. pl. p. 86.
(i) Ib. p. 88.
(k) P. 23.

testation, made in the name of afflicted Ministers indefinitely; neither can it ever be proved that all those Ministers did ever consent unto that opinion there specifyed, and alledged by him, viz. *We confine and binde all Ecclesiasticall power within the limits onely of one particular Congregation, &c.*

Thirdly, as for *Mr Bradshaw* that wrote the forenamed *Protestation*, & that book of *English Puritanisme*, if he were such an one as Mr Canne reports him to be now after his death, then were his testimony and his writing the lesse to be regarded. For he saith of him, that (l) *his prooses are alwayes* beggerly I sayes, *or* Ifs, *and* may be soes; *and doth not in all his writing, either directly or by sound consequence from the Scripture, confirme any one thing whereof he speaketh.* He accuseth him there also of *great hypocrisy* in pleading for many evills, of which his judgement was well knowne to be *wholy otherwise.* And in the same place upon an *if* and a *may be so*, which he had immediately condemned in others, upon a report which he judgeth *probable enough*, he compares him to *Baalams Asse, &c.* What meant Mr Canne to alledge such witnesses against me, whom he himselfe (though indeed very unworthily) hath so described as if they were not worthy to have any credit given unto them?

(l) Necess. of Separ. p. 217.

Touching *D. Ames*, & his judgement in this controversy, somewhat differently expressed in his severall writings, I have spoken at large (m) before, in answer to *Mr Dav.* his Allegations.

(m) P. 106. -111.

As for *Mr Hooker*, his argument (n) annexed to his Testimony, is of no force against us, seeing he concludes beside the question, which was not of every particular Church, but of such as stood already in combination with a Classis.

(n) Ch. pl. p. 88.

Concerning the Churches in *New-England*, Mr Canne saith, (o) *This may not be forgotten. Whereas there are many hundreds of our Country-men in* New-England, *they have not erected there any* Classicall Government, *but every particular Church exerciseth her owne, I say, within herself wholy; which is a sure argument to proove, that the forward professours in England approove not of this kinde of government here pleaded for; although he would feigne have his Reader to thinke so.* Hereunto I answer: 1. What the Government of the Churches in *New-England* is, and whether they refuse the help of Classes and Synods for the judgement and determination of their controversies, according to the order of Reformed Churches here in Europe; I know not: neither can I receive the testimony of Mr Canne & his bare word for a sufficient evidence herein, without some more authentick witnesse. Divers bookes have bene published touching the nature of that soyle, the fruits of the countrie, & the manners of the wilde people: but touching the Ecclesiasticall government and discipline there practised, I have as yet seene no monument thereof. It is probable enough that those Separatists which had bene of *Mr Robinsons* company here at *Leyden*, in their plantation would observe their old order, as neere as they could: and for some particular persons beside, I have heard of their inclination that way; but that there should be a generall agreement & resolution against Classicall Combinations, I heare not; and ought therefore to suspend my judgement for the present, touching their practise. 11. Suppose every particular Congregation in New-England were independent, and subject to no other Ecclesiasticall government out of itselfe; yet is this no sure argument to prove that the forward profes-

(o) Ib. P. 23.

ſours in England (as Mr Canne calles them) are generally of the ſame opinion alſo; ſeeing theſe in England may be ignorant of that which is done ſo farre of. Yea, ſo farre as I can heare, even ſuch as have bene diligent to enquire, cannot yet get any certaine information, what order of government is reſolved upon in New-England.

As for *Mr Bates*, I can ſay nothing touching his aſſent or diſſent in this poynt, ſeeing I have not ſeene his writing alledged againſt us.

For the reſt, they are all notably abuſed. For the Authour of the *Reply unto D. Downame*, though he affirme that *the adminiſtration of all Church-matters, at firſt was in every Congregation, the right in the Church, the execution in the Preſbyterie thereof*; this doth neither exclude the Claſſis in cenſuring of the Preſbyterie if they abuſe their power, nor hinder the Preſbyterie from ſeeking the help of the Claſſis in the exerciſe of their power, in matters of doubt and difficultie. The teſtimonies out of the *Centuries*, *D. Whitgift*, *Thomas Bell*, there (p) alleged by the *Replyer*, are anſwered already in the ſeverall places which Mr Canne hath aſſigned unto them in his writing; where it hath bene ſhewed that in this controverſie they are impertinent, & doe not proove any thing againſt us. Beſides Mr Canne had the leſſe cauſe to alledge this place in the foreſaid *Reply*, ſeeing the Authour in the very next page doth approve of that order, which for election of Church-officers is practiſed at *Geneva*, ſaying (q) that it is *religiouſly and prudently obſerved*. Mr Canne might there have ſeen himſelf condemned under the name of *Morellius*, even by this *Replyer* alſo, as well as by *Beza*; ſeeing it is as true of him, as of the other, that which is there ſayd, *that he hath preſumed by word and writing to reprehend that order, &c.* our courſe being in ſubſtance the ſame, and oppoſed by Mr C. in like manner as theirs was by *Morellius*. Againe, in the (r) next page the ſayd Authour doth expreſſely reject and deteſt that popular government, practiſed among the Browniſts, and pleaded for by Mr Canne, when having ſayd that the peoples conſent is *not to be neglected in cauſes of greateſt moment*, according to that which we teach and practiſe, he addes withall, *Notwithſtanding a meere* Democracie, *wherein all matters are handled of all (æquato jure) by an equall right; we doe no leſſe deteſt, then that uſurped Monarchie of Lordly Prelates, which other reformed Churches have aboliſhed*. And afterwards (ſ) when he allowes a preheminence for orders ſake, unto ſome one to be the mouth of the reſt, in *executing that which was by the whole Preſbytery decreed*, and then explaines that one to be *the Preſident of the Preſbyters, that is to ſay, in each Congregation the Paſtor, and in a Synod or aſſembly of the Paſtors and Preſbyters of many Churches, that one which with the conſent and choyſe of his brethren moderates the action*; there is no reaſon why we ſhould not hence conclude his approbation of Synods, ſuch as are and have bene celebrated in well ordered Churches; even ſuch as doe not onely adviſe, but alſo *decree* what is meet, as he had ſayd of the *Preſbyterie* in generall. As for the other places alledged out of this Authour, I referre the Reader unto that which I have ſayd (t) before touching the ſame, in my anſwer to *Mr Davenport*.

(p) Repl. par 2. l. 2. p. 104

(q) Ibid. p. 105.

(r) P. 106.

(ſ) P. 113.

(t) P. 116, 117.

Mr Parker, next alledged, *ſpeakes downe right in this thing*, ſaith Mr Canne. The words cited out of *Mr Parker*, are theſe, *All Eccleſiaſticall power is alwayes in the whole Congregation, from hence it flowes, as from the fountaine, and to the ſame it returneth*

as

as to the Sea. For anſwer hereunto, 1. This Teſtimony here alledged by Mr C. is not onely cited amiſſe, viz. *Pol.Eccl.l.3.c.6.* inſtead of *c.8.p.28.* and ſome words alſo unjuſtly added by him unto the teſtimony, to make it ſeeme more full for his purpoſe; but being taken as he ſets it downe, it doth not infringe the authority of Claſſes and Synods. For though all Eccleſiaſticall authority be ſayd to flow from the Church, as from a fountaine; this hinders not, but rather ſhewes how power may be and is derived unto Claſſes, when particular Churches as fountaines doe by deputation and delegation ſend forth a ſtreame of authority and power in Claſſicall and Synodall Aſſemblies, in ſuch manner as *Mr Parker* himſelf doth afterward (v) often ſhew unto his Reader. 11. For the *downe-right* ſpeech of *Mr Parker*, wherein Mr Canne glorieth, I deſire the Readers that underſtand, to review thoſe paſſages which I have (x) before noted at large out of *Mr Parkers* booke, & them that are able, to looke upon thoſe places in the booke itſelf, and then to judge whether Mr Canne be not either very blinde in alledging the teſtimonies of learned men, when he knowes not what they ſay; or els very impudent and diſhoneſt, in corrupting and perverting their teſtimonies contrary to their meaning.

(v) Pol. Eccl. l. 3 c. 13. & c. 23, 24, 25, &c.

(x) P. 89-105.

As for *Mr Baines*, he is confuſedly alledged, viz. *Dioceſ. Tryall*, *Concluſ.* 4. for whereas in that booke there is often mention of *Concluſ.* 4. who can tell what place he meanes? The trueth is that none of thoſe fourth Concluſions in any part of his booke, doe by any word empeach the authority of Claſſes or Synods. But on the contrary, in that his writing he gives plaine and evident teſtimonies of his agreement with us, as I have (y) already ſufficiently declared.

(y) P. 111-116.

Come we now to the teſtimony (z) alledged in the name of *D. Fulke*, whom Mr Canne praiſeth to be *a man famous and of rare learning*. They object unto me that he ſaith (a) *There ought to be in every Church an Elderſhip, which ought to have the hearing, examination and determining of all matters, pertayning to the Diſcipline & Government of that Congregation.* Hereunto I anſwer, that ſuch authority is to be exerciſed by the Elderſhip, yet ſo as that the judgement and conſent of the Congregation in weightier matters be not excluded: and ſo alſo that the judgement of the Claſſis or Synod be not refuſed or denyed. This Author will have the Elderſhip to determine all matters, if they be able to doe it; & ſo he expounds himſelf, ſhewing afterward that there be divers matters which the Elderſhip is not able by themſelves to finiſh without help of a Synod.

(z) Chu. pl. p. 23.

(a) Learned Diſcourſ. of Eccl. Gov. p. 84.

And becauſe Mr Canne in the margine of his booke ſets his marke over againſt this place, deſiring us to *Note this*: ſo I deſire both him and others to note wel what this Author writes concerning the authoriy, neceſſity, and uſe of Synods. I am glad to heare Mr C. to give ſo great commendation unto this indeed Learned Author, who is ſo pregnant a witneſſe for me and for Synods againſt the Browniſts. This is that which he (b) ſaith:

(b) Ibid. p. 81, 83.

„ Seeing our Saviour Chriſt promiſed his preſence and authoritie to every „ Church indifferently, *Matt.* 18.19.20: None may challenge any ſuch preroga- „ tive afore other: but as the Churches are limited out for order and convenien- „ cie, ſo is every one of them of like authority in itſelf: but becauſe they make „ all but one Church, and one body of Chriſt, therefore there is but one autho-

„ rity in them, to determine of matters concerning them all. By which there ap-
„ peareth to be a double authority of the Paſtor: one with the ſeverall Congrega-
„ tion, in which he is Paſtour, the other with the whole Synod or aſſembly,
„ whereof he is a member, and both theſe authorities, we finde ſufficiently autho-
„ riſed in the Scripture, &c.

(c) Ibid. p. 111,112. „ *Againe*, (c) There is a double authority of the Paſtour, the one joyned with
„ the Elders of the Church whereof he is Paſtour: the other with the Synod or
„ holy aſſembly, whereof he is a member. There ariſeth oftentimes in the
„ Church, divers Controverſies, which cannot otherwiſe be expreſſed, pertay-
„ ning to the ſtate of the whole Church, then by a generall aſſemblie of all the
„ Paſtours of that Church, which is called a Synod or Generall Councell. Alſo
„ there be divers caſes, wherein the ſeverall Churches, are driven to pray the ayde
„ of the Synod, where matters cannot be determined among themſelves. For this
„ cauſe the Holy Ghoſt hath ordained theſe Holy aſſemblies, with promiſe that
„ they being gathered together in the name of Chriſt, he himſelf will be among
„ them. With the Synod the Paſtour hath authority to determine, concerning re-
„ giment of the Church.

(d) P. 115, 116. 117. „ *Againe*, (d) Let us returne to the authority of the Synod, which conſiſteth in
„ deciding and determining ſuch matters as cannot otherwiſe in particular Chur-
„ ches be concluded, either becauſe they concerne the common ſtate of all Chur-
„ ches, or becauſe they lack ſufficient authority in ſome one Church. Firſt there-
„ fore the lawfull Synod hath to conſider, if any controverſy of doctrine doe ariſe,
„ that it be determined by the word of God: &c. Secondly, it hath to determine
„ of the uſe of the ceremonies, not of will without reaſon or ground of Scripture,
„ but upon neceſſary cauſes of avoiding offence and ſimilitude of ſuperſtition, of
„ bearing with the weak, of order and comelineſſe and edification. So did the Sy-
„ nod of the Apoſtles and Elders, command for a time abſtinencie from meat of-
„ fered to Idols, otherwiſe lawfull in it ſelfe, for offences ſake, &c. Alſo for or-
„ der and comelines, and beſt edification, the Synod hath to determine, what ſhall
„ be obſerved in particular charges: as of the time, place, and forme of preaching
„ and praying, and adminiſtring of the Sacraments. For who ſhould be able to
„ know what order, comelines and edification requireth according to Gods word,
„ but they that be teachers and preachers of the ſame unto all others? For it is ab-
„ ſurd, that they ſhould be taught by ſuch in theſe ſmall things, as ought to learne
(e) P. 118. „ the trueth of them in all matters, &c. (e) It is out of all controverſy, that before
„ there were any Chriſtian Magiſtrates (----) this authority was proper unto the
„ Synod. Which authority we know to be granted to the Church by our Saviour
„ Chriſt: practiſed by his Apoſtles: continued by their ſucceſſours three hundred
„ yeares, before there were any Chriſtian Emperours (---) and long time after
„ there were Chriſtian Emperours, even as long as any puritie continued in reli-
„ gion, untill both Emperours and Synods were thruſt out of all lawfull authori-
„ tie, which they ought to have in the Church, by the tyrannie of Antichriſt.

(f) P. 122, 123, 124. In the ſame *learned Diſcourſe of Eccleſiaſticall Government*, it is further added: (f)
„ The Synod hath further authority concerning Diſcipline, to reforme and re-
dreſſe

„ dreſſe by Eccleſiaſticall Cenſure, all ſuch defaults and controverſies, as cannot „ be determined in the particular Churches: as for example: If the Paſtour him- „ ſelfe, have need to be ſeverely puniſhed, where there is but one Paſtour in a „ Church: or if Elders, which ſhould be reformers of others, have notoriouſly „ miſgoverned themſelves: or if they have beene led by affection to condemne an „ innocent, or to juſtifye the ungodly: in theſe and ſuch like caſes, all contention „ is to be concluded, by the authority of the Synod. Some example we have „ thereof, *Act.* 15. where thoſe contentious Schiſmatiques, that withſtood Paul „ and Barnabas at Antiochia, were conſtrained to yeeld by authority of the Coun- „ cell, and Paul and Barnabas reſtored to their credit. For which cauſes Synodes „ ought oftentimes to be aſſembled, though not generall of the whole Realme, „ but particular of every Province or Shire, as it may be moſt conveniently, that „ ſuch things as are to be reformed, may be redreſſed with ſpeed.

Theſe and many other ſuch like aſſertions in allowance of Synods and their authority, hath this learned Authour, whom yet they have alledged againſt me. Had *Will. Beſt* but had ſo much wit or conſcience as to have duely looked upon theſe Engliſh Authors, being but ſmall treatiſes, and peruſed them diligently, he might eaſily have learned hereby what order God requires in the Government of his Church. But taking ſo much upon truſt, and preſuming blindely upon the fidelity and ſkill of a Browniſt, therefore is he runne into Scandall, having publiſhed many ſlanders againſt the Churches of Chriſt, and wreſted ſo many witneſſes againſt their meanings.

In the next place the Teſtimony of *Mr Fenner* doth fitly offer itſelf to be examined of us: for ſeeing he tooke upon him the Defence of the former Authour againſt *Bridges*, who impugned that *learned Diſcourſe of Eccleſ. Gov.* we have reaſon to exſpect that he alſo will defend the authority of Synods in like manner. As for the two pages which Mr Ca. (g) alledgeth, he neither ſpecifyeth his words, neither doe I finde in either of thoſe pages any one word againſt the uſe of Claſſes or Synods amõgſt us, but on the contrary a cleare teſtimony which he gives unto them. For ſpeaking there [*in pag.* 16.] of the *forme of Diſcipline appoynted of God*, and of the ſeverall *points* thereof *particularly ſet downe in the word of God*, with other he reckoneth up theſe, *the joynt care of Elderſhips and Synods*. Afterwards he ſpeaketh more fully in praiſe of this government, and ſaith, (h) *The nature of this order itſelf, which admitteth no Miniſter but learned, nor any deciſion of weight, but by adviſe of many, & with appointed conferences and Synods of learned men for ſuch purpoſes: beſides the aſſurance of Gods favourable bleſſing of his owne ordinance, and the experience of the Synodes of the Reformed Churches, the compariſon of their judgements, Canons, and other conſtitutions, with the like of the other in any part, beareth witneſſe, whether the want of learning and pietie both, muſt needes be greater in it, then in the other.* Whereas *D. Fulk* had given unto theſe Churches which have a Claſſicall and Synodall government, the title and praiſe of (i) *rightly reformed Churches*; when *D. Bridges* was offended therewith, *Mr Fenner* maintaines that praiſe to be due unto them, and commends (k) *their entire and whole obedience which they yeeld to God, in receyving all the holy doctrine of our Saviour Chriſt, both concerning things to be beleeved, and al-*

(g) Againſt Bridges p. 15, 16.

(h) Def. of Ecc. Diſci. ag. Bridg. p. 105.

(i) Learn. Diſc. of Ecc. Gov. p. 7.

ſo concerning the ſpirituall policie, Diſcipline and order, for guiding of his Church. And further, in the ſame place he repeats and undertakes to defend D. *Fulkes* words, perſwading *to imbrace that moſt beautifull order of Eccleſiaſticall regiment, which God doth ſo manifeſtly bleſſe and proſper in our neighbours hands.* Hereby it may appeare how farre *Mr Fenner* was from that erroneous and ſlanderous ſpirit of Mr C. and W.B. And here by the example of *W. Beſt* all ſimple & ignorant men are to be warned of publiſhing ſuch falſe things as he hath done, upon the credit of other men that are ſtrangers from the Churches of Chriſt. Moreover, the judgement of *Mr Fenner* in approving this uſe of Synods for the government of Churches and judgement of cauſes, may be clearly ſeen in ſundry other teſtimonies which he hath given to this purpoſe, and which I have (l) before noted: where among the reſt, when having maintained the right of Synods to be *jure divino*, alledging many Scriptures for the warrant thereof, he inferreth from hence this *common law* that other members of the Church which have no Eccleſiaſticall office, are to *be ſubject to this government, and ought to advance the ſame according to their power, &c.* it is thereby evident that he could not like the courſe of W. B. or any ſuch other ſchiſming from the Church for this cauſe, and complayning that they were not a free people, if they were ſubject to Claſſes and Synods.

(l) P. 84-88.

Mr Udall in the *Demonſtration of Diſcipline, pag.* 24,25. in that edition thereof which I have, hath no ſuch matter as is alledged before out of that treatiſe of *Engliſh Puritaniſme*, againſt the authority of Claſſes and Synods: neither is it to be found in any part of that *Demonſtration*, that *Chriſt hath not ſubjected any Congregation unto any other ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction, then unto that which is within itſelf, &c.* And therefore it is untruely affirmed of Mr Canne, that there is nothing there ſayd, but Mr *Vdall* with others above mentioned, hath *ſayd the like.* On the contrary, in that writing aſſcribed to Mr *Vdall*, there be ſundry teſtimonies ſhewing the authority of Synods to judge the cauſes of particular Congregations. As it was (m) before noted out of *D. Fulke* that there is a double authority of the Paſtour; one with the ſeverall Congregation in which he is Paſtour, the other with the whole Synod or Aſſemblie whereof he is a member, and both theſe authorities ſufficiently authorized in the Scriptures: ſo ſaith Mr *Vdall* to like purpoſe, (n) The word of God hath deſcribed ſufficient miniſters & miniſteries for doctrine, exhortation, overſeeing, diſtributing, *and ordering of every particular Church or generall Synod.* And againe, he ſaith of Biſhops or Paſtours, that (o) *they are of equall authority in their ſeverall charges, and in the generall government of the Church.* And in the ſame chapter he alledgeth the decrees of divers * Councels, ſhewing how the cauſes of one Church or Congregation were judged by many Biſhops of other Congregations meeting together. In ſpeciall, when ſome (p) objected that there would be *ſo many Elderſhips, ſo many divers faſhions, ſeeing one may not meddle with another:* Hereunto he anſwers, *The Government deſired is uniforme for every Church and admitteth no change, no not in outward ceremonies, without a Synod of the choyce men of ſeverall Elderſhips.* Hereby he plainely declares his meaning, what he judged concerning the power of Synods, for alterations to be made in particular Churches.

(m) P. 204.

(n) Demõſt. of Diſcip. c. 1.

(o) Ib. c. 10

* 2. Concil. Carth. tom. 1. c. 10. & 3 Conc. tom. 1. cap. 8.

(p) Demõſt. of Diſc. c. 14

The Agreement of the *Engliſh Church at Franckford in Queene Maries dayes*, is alſo

ſo alledged as a proofe of the *Non-conformiſts* diſſenting from me; whereunto I anſwer: 1. Thoſe three Articles of their Diſcipline objected; the one, that *the Miniſters and Seniours, ſeverally and joyntly, ſhall have no authority to make any manner of Decrees or Ordinances to binde the Congregation or any member thereof: But ſhall execute ſuch ordinances, as ſhall be made by the Congregation, and to them delivered:* Another, that *none ſhall be excommunicated, untill the matter be firſt heard by the whole Church:* And further, that *Miniſters and Seniours, and every of them, be ſubject to Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline, as other private members of the Church be*; theſe doe not at all concerne the queſtion betwixt us. For theſe things being granted, it doth not follow that then the authority of Synods is overthrowne, that they may not judge of any ordinances made in ſuch a Congregation; or that ſuch a Church where theſe Articles are agreed upon, hath thereby denyed and condemned ſuch a Claſſicall government, as we ſubmit ourſelves unto. 11. Theſe Articles of their Diſcipline are not rightly, and plainly, but darkly and confuſedly cited. In the quotation of the firſt, the *page* 115. is put for *pag.* 125. The two next are alledged without any quotation at all, either of page, or number of Article ſpecifyed in the booke; and both are joined together as if they were but one Article. And in the ſecond Article there is omitted that diſjunction, which affords an exception touching the ſtrict obſervation thereof. For whereas Mr Canne alledgeth it ſimply thus, *None ſhall be excommunicated untill the matter be heard by the whole Church*; the (q) booke itſelf admitteth the liberty of a different practiſe by adding this clauſe, *or by ſuch as it ſhall ſpecially appoynt thereunto.* This falſification is ſo much the greater, in that *Mr Horne* objecting againſt this Article, and arguing that thereby (r) *the authority of the Paſtour and Seniors is all wiped away; for every thing is referred to the confuſed multitude of the Congregation: Mr Whithead* in the ſame booke anſwereth him on this manner, *Where he ſaith, all things is referred to the confuſed multitude, it is manifeſtly falſe. For it is alwayes added, by ſuch as the Congregation ſhall appoint thereto: as it is alſo in the* 54 *Article added in plaine words.* Let the Reader obſerve this deceitfull allegation, both againſt the expreſſe words of the Article, & againſt the plaine explicatiõ thereof by *Mr Whit.* in the name of that Engliſh Church at Frankford.

(q) Diſc. of troubl. at Frankf. p. 129.

(r) P. 163, 164.

Whereas Mr Canne (ſ) objecteth further from *Art.* 26. & 67. that in ſome caſes the forenamed Engliſh Church agreed that *appeales ſhould be made unto the body of the Congregation*; I anſwer, that in ſuch caſes as are there ſpecifyed, *If the Miniſters and Seniours which have authority to heare & determine, &c.* (as it is elſwhere ſpecifyed, though not in this Article) *be ſuſpected or found to be parties*, that then they had reaſon to appeale rather to the body of the Congregation, then that parties ſhould be ſuffered to be judges in their owne cauſe. And no marvell, conſidering what I have noted (t) before touching the ſtate of that Church; where the Reader may ſee a further anſwer unto theſe objections. But then he aſkes me what I ſay to this, and hopes I will not ſay that they were Browniſts: I anſwer, His hope is right in this poynt, I may not ſay they were Browniſts, nor their practiſe the ſame with the Browniſts: 1. Becauſe they made this agreement through neceſſity, when they wanted a Claſſis, whereas the Browniſts wilfully oppugne and refuſe Claſſicall combinations. 2. Becauſe the Browniſts deny authority of judgement unto

(ſ) Chu pl. p. 36.

(t) P. 121-125.

unto Ministers and Elders, in such cases where they are no parties, which this (v) Church at Frankford did not. 3. Because the English Church at Frankford did not teach the doctrine of Separation, as the Brownists doe, but when they could not obtaine the reformation desired, did (x) still hold one another brethren in the Lord, though greeved for the defects among them.

(v) Art. 59. 63.

(x) Disc. of troub. Frankford, p. 187--191.

But it is wonder that Mr Canne is not ashamed to alledge the example of this English Church at Frankford: for whereas *G. Iohnson* in a peculiar (y) treatise which he wrote against his brother *Franc. Iohnson*, and that Church of the Brownists whereof he was Pastour, hath compared the troubles of these two Churches together; in the first part of this treatise, which is entitled, *The agreement between the banished English Church at Frankford in Q. Maries dayes, and some troubles in the banished English Church at Amsterdam in Q. Elizabeths dayes*; he brings more then an 100 severall instances to shew that where any disorder, scandall or offence was in the English Church at Frankford, the like evills, scandals and offences were also to be found and observed in the English Church of the Separatists in Amsterdam. And in the second part of this treatise, entitled, (z) *Differences between the Pastor, Elders & people in the troubles at Frankford in Q. Maries dayes, and the Pastor, Elders and people in the troubles at Amsterdam in Q. Elizabeths dayes*; he brings more then 20 severall instances to shew that the English Church of the Separation was worse then the other, and that where divers good orders and practises were in the English Church at Frankford, the same were wanting in the Church of the Brownists at Amsterdam. And in particular, let this be observed, that concerning the English Church at Frankford *G. Iohnson* (a) alledgeth, that *there was agreement among them, that the matter should be decided by learned men.* But concerning those at Amsterdam he saith, *These differ farre from them herein, they will not consent hereunto, they will not be perswaded, or intreated to let the Reformed Churches heare, try, judge, and end the controversy between them and us.* For proof hereof he notes in his margine, *This is witnessed by the testimony of the Dutch Preachers, given to the Pastors father.* Now instead of pleading from the orders of that Church at Frankford, it had bene fitter for Mr Canne to have taken warning from these unparalleld offences of his predecessours, not to maintaine the like disorders; or els to have answered these parallels and censures of *G. Iohnson*, and so to have removed (if he could) the scandall and blame which hath so long lien upon his fellowes for not answering this book.

(y) Disc. of troub. in the banish. English Church at Amsterd. p. 21--73.

(z) Ibid. p. 73--93.

(a) P. 74.

HAving considered the particular testimonies of Non-conformists, and how they have bene perverted by Mr Canne, in applying them against the authority of Synods; it shall not be amisse to adde yet further a threefold Testimony, to manifest this poynt more clearly and fully, and so to conclude this Section: namely by the Petitions of Non-conformists to Qu. Elizabeth, and to the Parliament; the opposition of the Prelates to the Non-conformists; & the scorne of the Brownists against Non-conformists.

First, when as the Ministers have made request unto *Q. Elizabeth* for reformation of things amisse, shewing how controversies may be compounded, they say, (b) that *a free Nationall or Provinciall Councell at home were much to be wished, &c.* And in a treatise annexed thereunto, entitled, *Opinions of such as sue for Reformation*, among other

(b) Petit. to the Q. most excel. Maj. p. 3.

other things which they hold & sue for, this is one, (c) *That if any dissention grow or cause of grievance be given in any particular Church by the Minister or Officers, the partie grieved might appeale to a particular Synod; from the particular Synod to a Provinciall Synod; from a Provinciall Synod to a Nationall Synod. Which Synods should be appointed at set times: the more particular the Synod is, the more often: for the time to be moderated by some fit man changeably by election, that might write, speak, and pray in the behalfe and at the direction of the rest, &c.* And a little after againe, (d) *they doe professe and protest, that they can and will avow this Reformation which they desire, to be most agreeable to the Scriptures, to have the testimonie of the best & most learned men that have bene since the Apostles, &c.* If Mr Ca. will not winke with his eyes, he may here see what reformation hath bene sought and held needfull, and that *Iure Divino*.

(c) Ibid. § 19. p. 57.

(d) § 21.

In like manner *Mr Travers* testifieth of these conferences, or Classes & Synods, (e) that *nothing could be more profitable then these Assemblies, being so used as they are appointed to be used by the word of God, and used by other purer and better reformed Churches, &c.* and concludes that his treatise of Discipline with an humble supplication unto *Qu. Elizabeth* of happy memory, for the establishing of such a Discipline in her dominions.

(e) Eccles. Disc. p. 98. with p 103, 104. reprin. 1617.

To like purpose doe they write which were the Authours of the *Admonition to the Parliament*, holden in the 13. yeare of Q. Eliz. begun Anno 1570, and ended 1571. They (f) describing the platforme of a Church reformed, and presenting their desire to the consideration of the Parliament, doe therein commend the use of *Conferences*, and of *Synods Provinciall*, *Nationall* and *Generall*, for *determining* the weighty causes which could not be ended in particular Churches. And they require that men should stand unto these determinations, unlesse they can be shewed to be contrary to the Scriptures.

(f) Admon. to Parl. p. 51 52. ed. 1617

Secondly, such as have bene speciall maintayners of the Prelacie doe confesse and testify that the Ministers which sought for reformation, did therein seek for government of the Church by Classes and Synods; and that not for counsell onely, but to judge the causes of particular Churches, and to censure such persons as were found guilty. It is by one of them manifested in a speciall (g) Record, that when divers Ministers not conforming were cast into prison, and some of them brought into the Starre-Chamber and examined upon their oathes, they declared the earnest endeavours of many Ministers for the obtayning of Classes.

(g) Danger. Positio. for Presbyteri. Governm. l. 3. c. 2.—15

And there among such as gave pregnant testimonie in allowance of Classicall government, are nominated these following; *Mr Clark, Mr Travers, Mr Gardiner, Mr Barber, Mr Chester, Mr Crook, Mr Egerton, Mr Field, Mr Wilcox, Mr Standen, Mr Lackson, Mr Bonham, Mr Crane, Mr Saincloe, Mr Edwards, Mr Cholmeley, Mr Wright, Mr Gifford, Mr Gelibrand, Mr West, Mr Browne, Mr Knewstubs, Mr Wight, Mr Walker, Mr Cartwright, Mr Fen, Mr Oxenbridge, Mr Perkins, Mr Allen, Mr Dike, Mr Culverwell, &c.* And about Northampton-shire alone are (h) recorded more then 20 of this minde. About Northampton; Mr *Snape*, Mr *Penrie*, Mr *Sibthorp*, Mr *Edwards*, Mr *Litlwon*, Mr *Bradshaw*, Mr *Larke*, Mr *Fleshware*, Mr *Spicer*, &c. About Daventrie; Mr *Barbon*, Mr *Rogers*, Mr *King*, Mr *Smart*, Mr *Sharp*, Mr *Prowdloe*, Mr *Elliston*, &c. About Kettring; Mr *Stone*, Mr *William-*

(h) Ib. p. 77

ſon, Mr Fawſbrook, Mr Patinſon, Mr Maſſey, &c.

(i) Ibid. p. 109. 110. &c. The lawes, rules and order, both in Claſſes and in Synods, deſcribed in that (i) book, and approved by theſe Miniſters, are moſt of them and generally the very ſame that are obſerved in the Claſſes and Synods of the Reformed Churches in theſe United Provinces of the Netherlands where we live, and where our Engliſh Church is combined with them in the ſame Eccleſiaſticall government. The agreement and conſent of theſe men in their deſire of Claſſes and Synods, according to the order and practiſe obſerved alſo in Scotland & at Geneva, is therefore by the Recorder hereof noted & ſtiled over the head of many pages in that book, *Engliſh Genevating for Reformation*: And againe, *Engliſh Scottizing for Diſcipline by practiſe*. Even theſe reproaches doe juſtly ſerve for the reproofe of Mr Canne, who denyes that which other oppoſites doe willingly acknowledge.

Thirdly, the very Browniſts themſelves were wont of old to acknowledge that the not-conforming Miniſters in England did ſtand for Claſſes and Synods. Though with great ſkorne & reproach they ſpeak of Synods, yet that very ſkorne and reproach is a witneſſe againſt Mr Can. and W. B. to ſhew the conſent of former times with me. *Hen. Barow* ſpeaking of the cenſures of evill, and condemning both Conformiſts and Non-conformiſts together, he ſaith; (k) Yea all the Prieſts „ of the land, both *Pontificall* and *Reformiſts* agree in this poynt, & conclude that „ the lay people (as they terme them) ought not to intermeddle either with the „ depoſing their Miniſter, or reproof of his doctrine. The one ſort (ſaith he) „ ſendeth them to their Lords theſe Biſhops, the other referreth them over for „ theſe and many other caſes under hand, to a Provinciall or Claſſicall Synod or „ permanent Councell of Prieſts, &c. Amongſt whom all theſe affaires muſt be „ debated, and after they are agreed upon the poynt, then their decrees to be „ brought forth, ſolemnly publiſhed and pronounced to the people, who muſt at- „ tend upon, wait, and receave theſe Oracles as moſt holy and Canonicall. They „ have no remedy if they alſo be contrary to the trueth, but to appeale to a Coun- „ cell, &c. And this he calleth a *deviliſh forgerie, &c.*

(k) H. Bar. Diſcov. of falſe Chur. p. 165.

(l) Ibid. p. 169. After that to like purpoſe he ſaith, (l) Theſe Prieſts, they will not onely not „ ſubmit their perſons and doctrine to the cenſure of the Church where they ad- „ miniſter (for they muſt have a Jurie of Clarkes, a *Claſſis* of Prieſts to goe upon „ them) but they binde their poore Church to their lippes & build it upon them- „ ſelves, and with their blazing light ſtrike all the reſt of their hearers & followers „ ſtark blinde. Againe, (m) By their Propheticall Conventicles and Claſſicall „ *Synods* they aſſume into their owne hands the key of all knowledge, and ſhutting „ up the Scriptures, yea all Gods graces, even the Holy Ghoſt itſelf among them- „ ſelves in theſe their Schooles of Prophets: as alſo into their Claſſes of ſelect „ Prieſts the ſcepter of Chriſt and abſolute government of all Churches, to „ whom it is left but to receive and execute the reverent decrees of this famous „ *Claſſis* of Prieſts.

(m) P. 169. 170.

In another place, having told how the *Pontificals* have opened their mouthes unto accurſed blaſphemy, then he returnes unto the *Reformiſts*, and ſpeakes on this „ wiſe, (n) The Phariſees of theſe times, I meane theſe your great learned Prea-

(n) P. 189. 190.

chers,

„ chers, your *Good men* that ſigh and grone for Reformation, but their hands with „ the ſluggard denie to worke. Theſe counterfaites would raiſe up a ſecond er- „ ror, even as a ſecond Beaſt, by ſo much more dangerous by how much it hath „ more ſhew of the truth. Theſe men inſtead of this groſſe Antichriſtian govern- „ ment which is now manifeſt and odious unto all men, would bring in a new a- „ dulterate forged government in ſhew, or rather in deſpite of Chriſts bleſſed go- „ vernment, which they in the pride, raſhnes, ignorance and ſenſualitie of their „ fleſhly hearts moſt miſerably innovate, corrupt and pervert, &c. The thing it- „ ſelfe they innovate and corrupt, in that they adde new deviſes of their owne; as „ their *Paſtorall ſuſpenſion* from their Sacraments, their ſet continued *Synods*, their „ *ſelect Claſſes* of Miniſters, their ſetled ſupreme Councell, &c.

That which *Mr Iohnſon* and others with him doe require, is more generall and ambiguous, viz. (o) *that the Church be not governed by Popiſh Canons, Courts, Claſſes, Cuſtomes, or any humane inventions, but by the lawes and rules which Chriſt hath appoynted in his Teſtament.* But that which *H. Barow* writes is more plaine, and more particularly applyed to the Miniſters of England, whom he calleth the *Reformiſts*. Of „ them he ſaith, (p) Their permanent Synods & Councels alſo which they would „ erect (not here to ſpeak of their new *Dutch Claſſes*, for therein is a ſecret) ſhould „ onely conſiſt of Prieſts or Miniſters as they terme them; people of the Chur- „ ches be ſhut out, & neither be made acquainted with the matters debated there, „ neither have free voyce in thoſe Synods and Councels, but muſt receave and „ obey without contradiction whatſoever thoſe learned Prieſts ſhall decree. Theſe „ Synods, and Councels ſhall have abſolute power over all Churches, doctrines & „ Miniſters, to erect, ratifie or abrogate, to excommunicate or depoſe at their plea- „ ſures: Their decrees are moſt holy without controulement, unleſſe it be by the „ Prince or the high Court of Parliament: Not here to ſpeake of their ſolemne „ orders obſerved in theſe Councils and Synodes, as their choice by ſuffrage a- „ mongſt themſelves of their *Archiſynagogon*, or Rector *Chori*, their Preſident (as „ they call him) propounder or moderator of their Councell; about which their „ predeceſſours have had no ſmall ſtir, untill their holy Father the Pope put an „ end to the ſtrife by getting the chaire. This ſtuffe they would bring in againe un- „ der colour of Reformation, theſe and many more their leavened corrupt wri- „ tings of Diſcipline, and their ſupplications unto the Parliament, declare: &c.

(o) Apol. of Brown. Per. 3 pot. 9. p. 64.

(p) Diſcov. p. 191.

„ Againe he ſaith, (q) Theſe *Reformiſts*, howſoever for faſhion ſake they give „ the people a little libertie to ſweeten their mouthes, and make them beleeve „ that they ſhould chooſe their owne Miniſters (for further right in the cenſuring „ their Miniſters, or in the ordering the affaires of their Churches they allow not, „ as hath bene ſayd) yet even in this pretended choice doe they coozen & beguile „ them alſo, leaving them nothing but the ſmoky windy title of election onely; „ injoyning them to chooſe ſome Univerſitie Clarke, one of theſe Colledge birds „ of their owne brood, or els comes a Synode in the necke of them, & annihilates „ the election whatſoever it be. They have alſo a trick to ſtop it before it come „ ſo farre; namely in the ordinatiõ, which muſt (forſooth) needs be done by other „ Prieſts: for the Church that chooſeth him hath no power to ordaine him: And

(q) Ib. P. 193

„ this makes the mother Church of *Geneva* and the *Dutch Classes* (I dare not say „ the secret Classes in England) to make Ministers for us in England. And these „ Ministers when they are come over, are esteemed & receaved as Angels in hell, „ and shine as bright starres in these smoky *Egyptian* fornaces, wherein the misera- „ ble people of the land are kept in most hard servitude, &c.

These skornfull and reproachfull speeches of *H. Barow* doe sufficiently testify what the Brownists of old thought of the Dutch Classes and Synods, and what they thought of such Ministers in England as desired a Reformation, and therein a Classicall government. Though *H. Barow* according to his manner doe overlash, and utter much fallhood; yet he is not guilty of so great fallhood as Mr Canne, in denying what the Ministers and forward professours in England (as he calles thē) did heretofore seek, and sue for. It is certaine and evident that the Non-conformists have (r) held that unto the just calling of a Minister there is required the calling of a particular and certaine Church where he is to administer: Yea so much is also confessed touching them by the (s) Prelatists, when by them it is recorded as a decree of the Synodicall Discipline, *that none should take upon him an uncertaine and vague ministery, though it be offered unto him; but such as be called to the ministery by some certaine Church, &c.* And againe, that none is to be accounted *a full Minister untill some particular Congregation had chosen him, &c.* For though as in these Churches, after due examination & approbation by a Classis, men are allowed to preach and to exercise their gifts occasionally, yet are not such esteemed Ministers, untill they be called by some Church, and confirmed therein. But *H. Bar.* as in divers other things so in this, speakes slanderously of the Classes, and of the Ministers approoving them, when as he saith, (t) *Both sides, both Bishops and this new Classis take upon them to make Ministers without the people, without any charge, place, or office certaine.* Though the fallhood of H. Bar. be manifest herein, yet Mr Canne goes a degree beyond him, when he thames not to deny the approbation which the Non-conformists have given to the Dutch Classes and Synods, which H. Bar. could not deny for the fact, though he impugne them as erring therein.

(r) Demōst. of Disc. c. 2. pr. 3. & p. 24, 25. Mr Travers of Ecc. Disc. p. 19, 20. Admon. to Parl. p. 15. edit. 1617.

(s) Dang. pos. l. 3. of Engl. Scoti. c. 3. p. 46. & c. 14. p. 114, 115.

(t) Discov. p. 175.

Let the Reader now observe here the palpable untrueth of Mr C. & of W. B. in their Apish imitation of my words, which they so falsely apply against me, saying, (v) *As Herod to kill one infant spared not to kill a multitude of other infants: so he, that he might undermine us and blow us up into the ayre, he cared not, nor spared not with the gunpowder of his fiery contention and reproaches to blow up with us a multitude of Godly and learned Ministers being of the same judgement with us.* I desire the Readers to looke upon my former (x) writing, and then to judge whether I had not just cause to complaine of their wounding the Classis through my sides, and of their reproaching the Ministers of these Reformed Churches under my name, in regard of their consent and practise agreeable to mine. I desire that the testimonies, confessions, and petitions of the ancient Non-conformists above mentioned, in allowance of a Classicall & Synodall government, may be duely pondered; & then let any indifferent Reader judge, whether I *undermine them and blow them up into the ayre, &c.* while I confirme their testimonies both by word and practise. But these opposites, Mr Canne and his client have so little conscience of trueth, that they have not cared

(v) Chu. pl. p. 88, 89.

(x) Answ. to W. B. p. 71, 72, 73. & 18, 29, 30, &c.

to

to utter the groſſeſt falſhood, ſo that they might but contradict me. Let them remember, *Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord.* Prov. 12. 22.

SECT. VI.

Touching the Teſtimonies of Ancient fathers, Councels, and Emperours.

THe Advocate of W. B. not conſt with the teſtimonies of men in later times, leades us back to the teſtimony of Antiquity, and to the Ages long before. And though he (a) confeſſe he had done it already, in mentioning ſome teſtimonies of the moſt ancient times; yet notwithſtanding to ſhew that he ſtands not for any *Notzley*, he profeſſeth againe, *he will ſhew that the beſt approved Authors, after the Apoſtles, are directly with them, in this thing, &c.* Thoſe which he alledgeth are theſe, *Ignatius, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Euſebius, Athanaſius, Epiphanius, Ierome, Ambroſe, Cyrill, Hilarie, Greg. Nazianzen, Auguſtine, Chryſoſtome, Baſill, Socrates, Iſidorus, Bernard.* And with theſe he alſo makes mention of *ſome Councells* and *Chriſtian Emperours.*

(a) Ch. pl. p. 89.

For anſwer hereunto, Firſt in generall it is to be obſerved, that the thing which he here pretends to prove, viz. that *everie particular viſible Church of Chriſt, hath power to exerciſe Eccleſiaſticall government, and all other Gods ſpirituall ordinances, in and for itſelf immediately from Chriſt*; this comes ſhort of the queſtion betwixt us. For this being granted, it doth not follow hereupon that the power of Claſſes and Synods is an *undue power*, or that particular Churches may not therefore ſtand under the authority of another ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall judicatory out of themſelves. This their inference will never be made good from ſuch a ground. This beggerly conſequence I have oft (b) refuted before.

(b) P. 145, 146, 149, &c.

To come more particularly unto the teſtimonies of theſe Authours, which he promiſeth to ſet downe *according to the times in which they lived*: And to beginne firſt with *Ignatius*; from him he alledgeth that it was then the manner of viſible Churches (c) *to come together in one place, to worſhip God, having Biſhops, Elders and Deacons unto their Officers, whom the people freely choſe by voyces, or lifting up of hands.* I anſwer; I. All that is here ſayd being granted, it followes not that they were independent, and refuſed to ſubmit their controverſies to the judgement of other Churches aſſembled in Synods. *Ignatius* being Miniſter of the Church of *Antiochia* in *Syria*, which had of old ſubmitted their controverſy to the Synod held at Ieruſalem, *Act.* 15. what reaſon is there to thinke they forgot their old practiſe, approved by the Apoſtles themſelves? II. Though it be probable, and we in judgement of charity are bound to thinke that the Officers, Biſhops, Elders, and Deacons of this Church were choſen with the free conſent of the people, according to the direction of the Apoſtles; yet is not ſo much ſpecifyed in any of thoſe three Epiſtles here mentioned in the margine, and therefore are they vainely alledged for the proof thereof. III. *Ignatius* labouring for the peace and eſtabliſhment of the Church of Antiochia after his death, deſired the Church of Philadelphia (d) *to chooſe a Biſhop, which being ſent thither as an Embaſſadour in the Embaſſage of God, it might be granted unto them to glorify God in their meeting together.* He ſpeakes there not of choo-

(c) Ad Philadelph. ad Magneſ. ad Trall.

(d) Epiſt. ad Philadel. p. 76. edit. Pariſ. 1562.

choosing a Bishop to minister in their owne Church, but of choosing one to be their Deputy, to travell unto the Synod or meeting in Antiochia for settling of order in that Church. And in the same place to moove them the more, he sheweth what was the practise of the Primitive Churches in such cases, viz. that *alwayes the neighbour Churches did send Bishops, and some of them Elders and Deacons.* Againe, writing upon the same occasion unto *Polycarpus*, Bishop of *Smyrna*, he saith (e) *It was meet to gather a Synod comely in the Lord, and choose some dearly beloved and diligent person, which might be called Theodromos*, [or one that should runne for God,] *who might travell into Syria, and thereby celebrate their diligent love to the praise of God.* And using many argumentes to commend that businesse unto him as the work of God, he intreateth *Polycarpus* that he would write unto other Churches, that they would doe the same thing; that they which were able would send men to travell on foot, that others would send their letters to be conveyed by such as *Polycarpus* should send thither. From these testimonies of *Ignatius*, Mr Parker (f) concludes that in those times, according to the practise of the Reformed Churches with us, *neighbour Churches were combined together as it were Classically, for the mutuall communication of offices.* And whereas D. *Bilson* (g) confesseth that it was the manner of that time, if any Church was tossed with waves of discord, that neighbour Churches round about did send a Bishop, Elder or Deacon for appeasing that tempest: Mr *Parker* inferres justly thereupon, *If neighbour Churches had right* or authority *in compounding of strifes, why not also in moderating of elections?* His conclusion in the same place is, *Let this very right in compounding strife be a sufficient authorization for our Classes.* Thus then it is apparant that *Ignatius* was not directly with Mr Canne, as he boasteth, but his meaning hath bene manifestly perverted contrary to his words.

(e) Epist. ad Polyc. p. 97, 98.

(f) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 24. p. 356.

(g) Perpet. Gov. c. 7.

Tertullian, that is next alledged (though misalledged, c. 29. being put for c. 39.) relating the manner of Christian assemblies in his time, saith in effect, (h) *They came together into the Congregation* [it is not sayd into *one* Congregation, as Mr C. alledgeth it] *for to pray unto God, for to rehearse the Divine Scriptures, and with holy words to nourish faith, stirre up hope, and fasten confidence. And they used exhortations, reproofes and divine Censure.* I answer: 1. Though particular Churches met together for such end, this hinders not but that the Deputies of those same Churches might meet together in Synods, for their mutuall assistance in the judgement of more weighty and difficult causes. It followes not because severall Congregations have their due power, that therefore the power of Classes is an undue power. II. That *Tertullian* himself intended no such thing, it appeares evidently by the great approbation and commendation which he gives unto Synods, in saying, (i) *The appointed Synods are kept through the countries of Græcia in certaine places out of all the Churches, whereby both the deeper* or more difficult matters *are handled in common, & by that representation of the whole Christian flock they are celebrated with great reverence.*

(h) Apol. c. 39.

(i) De Jejuniis adverſ. Pſychi. c. 13

He alledgeth the words of *Origen*, writing much to the same purpose, (k) *Such as were brought in the third place, for sinne unto the Congregation; if they stood obstinate, by the judgement of the whole Church were excommunicated from the body, the Elders of the Church pronouncing the sentence.* And then in his owne words he sayth, (l) *Observe here, he saith not that the matter was caried to a Classis, and there first determined, &c. but*

(k) In Jos. Hom. 7.

(l) Ch. pl. p. 90.

names

names onely the Congregation, and Elders thereof; notwithstanding had there bene any such superiour judicatorie Assembly, it is likely he would have omitted it, and mentioned a subordinate and inferiour one. ANSVV. I. The words which they alledge in another letter in *Origens* name, as if they had bene his speech verbatim described, are not his words. He neither speakes of men *brought unto the Church*, nor of the *judgment* of the Church, nor of *Elders pronouncing the sentence*: he shewes how all the people might be polluted by the sinne of one man, when *the Priests which rule the people being unmindefull of priestly severity* doe not rebuke, nor take away evill from them, nor make him as a Publicane and Heathen which hath despised the admonition of the Church; but not in such words and forme of speech as Mr Canne faineth. II. All that *Origen* there speakes is not repugnant to Classicall government: all that he there requireth is duly performed by the Churches among us, which stand under the government of Classes and Synods. Obstinate offenders having their names and offences divers times published before the whole Congregation, are with the consent thereof excommunicated, by the judgement of the Eldership going before. III. If *Origen* in his writings had expressely denyed the authority of Synods, it had bene of no great weight against the generall judgement of other ancient Fathers; the rather, seeing his writings are rejected and condemned by so many, especially by *Epiphanius* and *Hieronie*, the Authours hereafter alledged by Mr Canne. And see how vaine many of his glosses were even touching this poynt. Speaking of *the keyes of the kingdome of heaven*, Mat. 16. he there telles us of many keyes to open severall gates in heaven, that (m) *Temperance is one key to open the Gate of Temperance in heaven; that Iustice is another key to open another Gate, and so for all other vertues.* And afterwards expounding the promise made Matt. 18. 18. touching binding and loosing in heaven, & comparing it with the promise made unto Peter Mat. 16. 19. because a word of the plurall number is used in the promise to Peter, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, *in cœlis*, and to others a word of the singular number, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, *in cœlo*; Origen from thence (n) teacheth us this Doctrine, that Peter did binde and loose in all heavens, whereas some others did but binde and loose in one heaven. And therefore he concludeth, *Look how much better he is that bindeth, by so much is he that is bound, bound in more then one heaven: and by how much better he is that looseth, by so much the more blessed is he that is loosed, because he is loosed in all the heavens.* Such are many of the interpretations of Origen. IV. As Mr Canne misalledgeth Origen to impugne the authority of Classes and Synods; so other more learned & judicious Writers alledge him on the contrary for proof thereof. *D. Whitaker* to vindicate the authority of Synods against the Papists, and to prove their power above the Pope, argueth (o) from the greater assistance of the Holy Ghost, and of Christ governing his Church, to wit, in Synods; and for declaration hereof brings the testimony of *Origen*, noting upon *Rom.* 15. that *it is sayd to none of the Apostles singularly, and to none of the faithfull, I will be with thee; but unto a multitude of Churches plurally, I will be with you.* And Mr Parker (p) from him repeateth againe the same Argument, taken from the testimony of *Origen*. And besides this it is noted by the (q) *Magdeburgenses* how *Origen* himself was employed in di-

(m) Orig. in Mat. 16.

(n) Idem in Mat. 18.

(o) De Cõc. qu. 5. p. 883.

(p) Pol. Eccl. l. 3. c. 12. p. 89, 90.

(q) Cent. 3. c. 9.

vers

vers Synods in *Arabia*, for the conviction of ſundry hereſies.

(r) Lib. 3. Epiſt. 14. & 20. *Cyprian* is in like manner perverted: for when as he (r) reprooving thoſe Elders that without conſent either of the people, or of their Paſtour, had raſhly received unto the Communion againe ſuch as were fallen and become Apoſtates, before their due confeſſion of fault, doth ſhew that ſuch things ought not to be concluded without common conſent of the Church; and confeſſeth alſo that (ſ) the people chiefly have power to chooſe worthy Miniſters, and to refuſe unworthy ones; this we alſo aſſent unto, while that power is uſed aright. But in the ſame place he gives a cleare teſtimony for the warrant of Synods in deciding of weightier cauſes, when in that Synodall Epiſtle written by *Cyprian*, *Cæcilius*, *Primus*, *Polycarpus*, *and many others*, in the name of the Synod then aſſembled together it is ſayd,

(ſ) L. 1. ep. 4

(t) Art. 6, 7. that (t) *it is to be obſerved and held by divine Ordinance and Apoſtolicall obſervation, which is alſo kept among us, and almoſt through all the Provinces, that for the right performing of ordination, all the neare Biſhops of that Province are to aſſemble together unto that people, to which an Overſeer is ordained, &c.* And of this practiſe he there gives an inſtance in the ordination of *Sabinus*, and in the depoſition of *Baſilides*, and ſhewes the reaſon thereof, *that by the ſuffrages of the whole brotherhood, and by the judgement of thoſe Biſhops, which were preſently aſſembled together, the office of a Biſhop might be conferred upon him, and that hands might be layd upon him inſtead of Baſilides.* And beſides this, we finde there many (v) other pregnant evidences of the uſe, neceſſity and authority of Synods in thoſe times. From thence *S. Gentianus* in his anſwere to *Pamelius* his annotations on *Cyprian*, doth (x) confirme the liberty of Churches in maintayning yearely their Provinciall Synods, &c. From thence alſo Mr *Parker* confirmes the uſe of Claſſicall government in theſe Reformed Churches, and concludes, (y) *Why doe I ſpend time? There is nothing more evident to him that is acquainted with the ancient monuments of hiſtory, then that neighbours (even beſides the Synod) did eſſoyne meet together for deciding of ſtrifes, for ordinations, for diſſolving of doubts, and in ſummes, for every weighty buſineſſe. Of which aſſemblies the Epiſtles of* Cyprian *are full. And theſe aſſemblies what are they els but Claſſicall aſſemblies?* And againe in the ſame place; *Hereof we have examples every where in the Epiſtles of Cyprian.* A little after, *Who ſees not here the lively portraiture of our Claſſes?* And, *Oh how doth the Hierarchy offend which hath baniſhed this moſt pleaſant combination of Claſſes?* Hereby the Reader may judge whether it be not an abſurd and ſenſeles boaſting of Mr *Canne*, who oppugning this Claſſicall government, is not aſhamed to ſay of Cyprians teſtimony in theſe Epiſtles, *What can be more full and abſolute to our purpoſe then this?* With what judgment doth this man read the writings of the Fathers?

(v) Cypr. L. 1. ep. 2. & 5 Firmil. ad Cyp. Ep. 75. p. 236.

(x) P. 243. ad annot. 14

(y) Pol. Ecc. l. 3. c. 24. de Claſſib. p. 356, 357.

It is ſayd in the (z) next place, Euſebius *teſtifyeth that the Churches of the moſt famous Cities were in their conſtitution firſt, but one ordinary conſtant Congregation, as* Jeruſalem (b), Epheſus (c), Alexandria (d), Hierapolis (e), Corinth (f), Sardis (g), &c. *This being ſo, then it followes, that primitively they were independent; and ſtood not under any other Eccleſiaſticall authority, out of themſelves.* In the allegation of theſe teſtimonies out of *Euſebius*, there be divers miſtakings and faylings of memory or attention; *Hierapolis* with reference to L. 4. 1. where it is not mentioned, but in L. 3. 32. *Corinth* with reference to L. 3. 32. where it is not found, but after in L. 4. 22.

(z) Ch. pl. p. 90.
(b) Euſ. l. 3. 11.
(c) L. 3. 28.
(d) 3. 13.
(e) 4. 1.
(f) 3. 32.
(g) 4. 22.

4.22. *Sardis* alledged with reference to L. 4.22. where there is no mention at all thereof, but there is such a mention of *Athens* as is intended for *Sardis*. These slips of memory are to be noted for help of the Reader that would examine the places, but may well be excused in such a number of quotations. To leave them and to come unto the great abuses here to be observed; 1. In all the places here alledged, *Eusebius* doth not testify that the Churches of these Cities, *were in their constitution first, but one ordinary constant Congregation*; he hath no such words. He gives unto them the name and title of *a Parish*; but it is not proved that in every Parish there was but one ordinary constant Congregation. Whether they were so or not, this title of Parish proves is not. 11. The consequence made from hence is more evidently false: for to admit these Churches were at the first but one ordinary constant Congregation, yet doth it not at all follow that therefore primitively they were independent, and stood not under any other Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves. Both our English Church here, and generally other Reformed Churches in these countries were in their first constitution, and for the most part still are but one ordinary Congregation; and yet from the first stood under the Ecclesiasticall authority of Classes and Synods, in which they were combined. 111. Suppose some of the Churches either in *Eusebius* time or in later times, did not at their first constitution stand under the authority of Synods, when Churches being so few, and so farre distant, they wanted opportunity of combining themselves together for their mutuall assistance; this hinders not but that upon the encrease of neighbour Churches they might afterwards submit themselves unto this order. 1v. That the Primitive Churches whereof *Eusebius* writes in his history, did stand under another Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves, and were subject unto their censures, he makes it evident by sundry instances. He (h) records how the errour of *Montanus* was judged and condemned by many Synods in Asia: how (i) *Novatus* and the *Catharists* were excommunicated by a Synod holden at Rome, consisting of 60 Bishops, with many Elders and Deacons: how (k) *Paulus Samosatenus* was deposed and excommunicated by a Synod holden at Antioch. He declares (l) at large and celebrates the piety of *Constantine*, the great friend & maintainer of Christian religion, for assembling the Nicene Synod, wherein *Arius* was condemned. And in like manner he shewes the (m) impiety of the Emperour *Licinius*, the enemy of God, who by a mischievous devise sought to ruinate the Churches of God by depriving them of their liberty in meeting together in Synods, for deciding of their controversies. So expressely and clearely doth *Eusebius* give testimony unto Synods.

(h) Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 14.
(i) L. 6. c. 42
(k) L. 7. c. 29.
(l) De vita Const. l. 3. c. 6, 7, &c.
(m) Ibid. l. 1. c. 44.

That which is collected out of *Athanasius*, viz. that *elections, excommunications, &c. according to the Apostles precept, ought to be done in the publick Congregation by the Ministers, they taking first the peoples voyce or consent*; is such as I doe willingly assent unto. Neither was there ever any election, either of Minister, Elder, or Deacon, nor any excommunicatiō of any offender among us, but that the matter was first solemnely communicated with the Church, and declared severall times in the publick Congregation, & the consent of the people required & obtained before any such act was confirmed & finished among us. But what is this to the purpose?

Athanasius notwithstanding this doth witnesse unto us, that the causes and controversies of particular Churches, were in his time submitted to the censure of other Churches, and to another superiour Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves. This *Athanasius* shewes in these very places here alledged against me: And in the first of them, having (n) made a lamentable narration of the miseries procured to the Church of *Alexandria* by the intrusion and cruelty of an Arian Bishop, he then most vehemently supplicates unto those that were members of the same body with them in other Churches, that as the former yeare their brethren at Rome were willing to have called a Synod, but that they were hindred; so they having greater occasion to vindicate the Church of God from new evills, would [καταψηφίσασθαι] *by their suffrages condemne*, and reject the Authors of such mischiefes. And more plainely in the 2d place, he declares (o) at length that in the Synod holden at *Sardica*, where *Hosius* was President, and whither the accusers of *Athanasius* were cited, the cause being heard, the Synod did not onely advise and counsell what was meet to be done, but did give sentence touching the matters of controversy, absolved *Athanasius*, and deposed the Bishops that were found guilty, such as *Stephanus*, *Menophantus*, *Acacius*, *Georgius*, *Vrsacius*, *Valens*, *Theodorus*, *Narcissus*. As for the third allegation [*Epist. cont. Nicæ. c. 9. Ecc. Hist.*] it seemes to be misquoted: I finde no such Title in all the works of *Athanasius*. Instead thereof therefore, let us see another testimonie of his, wherein he teacheth what the government of the Church was in those times, namely ruled by authoritie of Synods, where the weightier causes were judged & decided. Of this he (p) gives instances in the Synods of *Alexandria*, *Greece*, and *Spaine*, where *Euzoius*, *Eudoxius*, and such principall offenders were deposed from their offices, and other upon their repentance retained. And the like Ecclesiasticall authority is in many other places throughout his writings by him commended unto us. Let us heare how Mr C. proceeds.

(n) Tom. 1. Epist. ad ubiq. Orthodoxos.

(o) Epist. ad Solit. vitam agentes.

(p) Tom. 2. Epist. ad Rufinian.

I. C. *To these we will adde* Epiphanius, Ierome, *Ambrose*, Cyrill, *Hillarie and Greg. Nazianzen; writers in noe age. Touching Ecclesiasticall Government, these to this purpose speake:* Particular Churches may lawfully ordaine their owne Bishops, without other Presbyters assisting them; *Epiph. cont. Hær.* 73. and among themselves excommunicate offenders. *Id. l.* 1. *Hæres.* 30. *Tom.* 2. *Hær.* 5. ANSVV. 1. Here be three places at once misalledged: In the two latter, viz. *Hær.* 30. and *Hær.* 5. there is nothing at all spoken touching this poynt. In the first of them, viz. *Hær.* 73. he doth but catch at a shadow, and pervert the words of *Epiphanius*, and falsifie them, by changing some and adding other, and omitting other that might give light unto the question. His words upon occasion of *Meletius* his confession and suffering for the trueth, are these; *There are many people of this order of this Synod, which setting Bishops over themselves, doe make a marvellous confession touching the faith, & doe not reject the word* Coessentiall. *Yea and say they are ready, if there were a perfect Synod, to confesse & not to deny it.* Here is no mention of *particular Churches* or Congregations; nor of *lawfully ordayning*, nor of doing this *without other Presbyters assisting them*. But that which is recorded touching the acknowledgement of a lawfull or *perfect Synod*, that

that is omitted. Thus he varyeth from the Latine translation of *Epiphanius*: the Originall Greek in divers Copies is further from the matter; having this beside other differences, οἱ ἐπισκόπους ἑαυτοὺς καταστήσαντες, *which made themselves to be Bishops*, instead of lawfully ordaining their owne Bishops. Such are the Allegations of Mr Canne. II. Suppose the words of *Epiphanius* had bene the same that Mr C. relates, yet had not the authority of Synods bene any thing diminished thereby. Is it not the common and ordinary practise in these Reformed Churches, that where two or more Ministers are in one Congregation, there the newly elected Ministers are ordained and confirmed without any other Presbyters from other Churches to assist them? Yet this is no good argument to prove they want Classes and Synods. And though also they doe among themselves excommunicate offenders; yet this hinders not but that Classes or Synods may exercise their authority in judging or censuring such as have unjustly excommunicated any, or proceeded contrary to their advise therein. III. That *Epiphanius* did approve the authority and jurisdiction of Synods, it is manifest by his practise. It is (q) recorded of him that he being Bishop of *Salamis* or *Constantia* in *Cyprus*, procured a Synod to be called in that Iland, wherein the bookes of *Origen* were condemned, & a decree made that none should read his bookes. IV. *Epiphanius* did not onely approve the lawfull authority of Synods; but he went further and did maintaine the unlawfull authoritie of particular persons over divers Churches. This appeareth in his (r) condemning of *Aërius* of heresie, that held Bishops & Presbyters to be the same by divine institution; whom *D. Whitaker* (s) doth justly defend against *Bellarmine* and others, and shewes that *Hierome* and other ancient Fathers were of the same minde with *Aërius* therein; and sayth that we are not to regard the absurd men that doe so often object *Aërius* unto us: he sayth *Epiphanius* doth foolishly and childishly answer the testimonies produced by *Aërius*, and wonders that such a Divine that tooke upon him to refute all Heretickes, did not see his owne foule errour. Yea it is further (t) recorded of *Epiphanius*, that he disorderly intruded himself into the charge of *Chrysostome*, contrary to the Ecclesiasticall Canons observed in those times, by celebrating the Lords supper & ordaining a Deacon in the Church at Constantinople. And thus we see Mr Cannes witnesses are in extremity opposite unto himself.

(q) Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 9.

(r) Epiph. Hær. 75.

(s) De Pont. Rom. q. 1. p. 104, 105, 106.

(t) Soc. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 11, 13.

Another of his witnesses is *Ierome*, from whom he alledgeth, that (v) *In every Congregation there ought to be a Senate or assembly of Elders.* To this I answer, I. This is nothing against the authority of Synods. The Reformed Churches have in every Congregation such a Senate of Elders: and yet this hinders not but that they have & ought to have Classes & Synods also, both for direction and correction of Elderships, and for decision of the controversies arising in particular Churches. II. Though every Congregation ought to have a Senate of Elders; yet *Ierome* doth not avouch so much in the place alledged. His words are falsifyed: for in the place which they misquote (*ad Gal.* instead of *ad Alg.*) the words of Jerome are these, (x) *How great the traditions of the Pharisees are, which at this day they call* δευτερώσεις, *and what old wives fables, I cannot expresse. For neither doth the greatnes of the*

(v) Jer. ad Gal. q. 10.

(x) Ad Algas. qu. 10.

booke permit: and many of them are so filthy, that I blush to tell. And yet (saith he) *I will tell one of them, to the ignominy of that envyous nation. They have Rulers in their Synagogues, of their wisest men, deputed unto a filthy work, &c.* What this filthy work was, though Jerome expresse it, yet I thinke it shame to publish. And this which he saith in detestation of the Jewes, without approbation of their order, is all that he there saith for an assembly of Elders. So vaine and insufficient are the Allegations of Mr Canne. III. That Hierome allowed the authority of Synods above particular Churches, it may appeare by that he sayth, (y) *Si authoritas quæritur, orbis major est urbe. If we seek for authority, greater is the world then the city*; that is, as D. Whitaker expounds the same, the Churches dispersed through the world: he sayth, (z) *All the authority of the Church of Rome, is not so great as is the authority of all Churches every where.* And thereby he acknowledgeth the authority of Synods arising from the deputation of many Churches, to be greater then the single authority of any one particular Church. Besides, whereas *Damasus*, Bishop of Rome, was a zealous opposite to the Arian, Macedonian, and other heresies, and in divers Synods furthered the censure and condemnation of such as persisted in those errours, and wrote divers Synodicall Epistles which witnesse the exercise of that authority by Synods, *Hierome* (a) confesseth that in the writing of those Synodall letters he did assist and help *Damasus*, which he could not with good conscience have done, unlesse he had allowed the authority of Synods. Lastly, if *Hierome* wrote that in every particular Congregation there ought to be a Senate or assembly of Elders; then is Mr Canne and his Congregation condemned by *Hierome*, because they have now for many yeares had no Senate nor assembly of Elders, to governe them; Mr Canne being sole governour of them, without an Eldership.

(y) Ad Eugrii Ep. 85.

(z) De Pont. Rom. qu. 1. p. 98, 99.

(a) Ad Gerontiam.

In the next place, touching this assembly of Elders, he addes, that *The power of choosing them is in the people.* And for this he alledgeth three Authours together, (b) *Hierome, Hilarie, Cyrill.* I answer: For *Hierome, ad Rusticum*; there is nothing at all spoken touching the matter, but he is falsely alledged. For *Hilary*, I. He is also falsely alledged: he sayth nothing touching the Senate or assembly of Elders, of which Mr C. speakes. II. Though he entreat *Constantius* the Arian Emperour, who had banished many worthy Bishops, *that he would permit the people to heare those Teachers and Ministers of the Sacraments, whom they would, whom they thought good, and whom they had chosen, that they might offer up prayers for his safety and felicity*; yet doth he not hereby prejudice the authority and jurisdiction of Synods. This hinders not but that Synods might censure and judge of the elections made by the people, and of other controversies of particular Churches. III. *Hilary* also (c) wrote a peculiar booke touching Synods, extant among his workes, which he had translated out of Greek into Latine, wherein the Acts and decrees of divers Synods that censured and condemned the Arian heresy, are recorded. Had he thought with my opposites, that this jurisdiction of Synods had bene an usurped and unlawfull power; he ought not to have given so much approbation of them, in alledging their authority for defense of his opinion, without some testification against their power. Besides, what colour of reason hath Mr C. to shew that *Hilarius* should vary from the judgement of Orthodox Bishops, who in that age

(b) Ad Rust. Hil. ad Cōst. August. Cyr. in Ioh. 20. 21.

(c) Cent. Magdeb. Cent. 4. c. 10. col. 1134, 1135.

or-

(d) ordinarily uſed to meet together in Synods for the exerciſe of Eccleſiaſticall juriſdiction? (d) Ib. Cent. 4. c. 7. col. 519. & 528 &c.

For *Cyrill* in *Ioh.* 20. 21. whom he alſo brings to prove that the Senate or aſſembly of Elders, ought to be choſen by the people, he is in like manner abuſed and falſely alledged by him. For 1. *Cyrill* upon thoſe words of Chriſt, *As the Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you*: ſayth that Chriſt *in thoſe words ordained the Teachers of the world, and Miniſters of the divine myſteries, &c. That therefore Paul is true, ſaying, No man takes this honour unto himſelf, &c. Heb.* 5. *&c.* He ſhewes how Chriſt called his Diſciples, but hath not a word, neither touching an aſſembly of Elders, nor of their chooſing by the people. Such falſhood and forgery there is in the Allegations of Mr C. And yet if he had ſpoken as much as is here pretended, it had bene no empeachment unto the authority of Synods, as was ſhewed before. 11. That this *Cyrill*, Biſhop of Alexandria, did acknowledge the uſe of Synods, not onely for counſell and admonition, but for cenſure and judgement of cauſes, it appeareth evidently by his practiſe, while in the (e) Synod holden at *Epheſus*, in the time of *Theodoſius*, he being a principall member of that Synod, did together with others give ſentence againſt *Neſtorius*, and depoſed him from his office, for his obſtinacy in refuſing to appeare before them, and for his hereſy whereof he had bene convicted. (e) Euagr. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 1. c. 4.

The next witneſſe abuſed by him is *Ambroſe*, who is alledged to ſhew what the Senate or aſſembly of Elders is to doe, viz. (f) *Theſe with ſpirituall bridles order men, &c.* I anſwer: 1. In the place alledged, there is not a word to be found, either touching a Senate of Elders, or touching ſpirituall bridles, or any thing to like purpoſe. 11. If a Senate of Elders be ſpirituall bridles, then the Browniſts with Mr C. that now want ſuch a Senate, are an unbridled company, wanting order, &c. 111. What though an aſſembly of Elders order men with ſpirituall bridles? Is there therefore no other ſpirituall bridle in the authority of Synods? What conſequence is this? 1v. That *Ambroſe* did allow the authority and juriſdiction of Synods, it appeares, both by his practiſe, he (g) himſelf being preſent with *Damaſus*, *Britto*, *Valerian* and other Biſhops at the Synod holden at *Rome* for the cenſure of *Apollinaris* and *Timotheus* his diſciple; and by his (h) exhortation given unto *Theophilus* and others, to judge the cauſe of *Euagrius* and *Flavianus*, being deputed thereunto by the Synod of *Capua*: and againe by his (i) exhortation given unto *Theophilus* & *Anyſius*, that they being choſen by the ſame Synod of *Capua*, would give ſentence touching *Bonoſus* and his accuſers, foraſmuch as the Synod had give this authority unto them, and they did now ſupply the place thereof. (f) Amb. Offi. l. 1. c. 1 (g) Theod. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 9. (h) Amb. Tom. 3. epi. l. 10. ep. 78. ad Theoph. (i) Ib. Epi. 79. ad Theoph. & Anyſ.

With Ambroſe he joynes (k) *Nazianzen*, to teſtify alſo that a Senate or aſſembly of Elders doe with ſpirituall bridles order men. But in the place alledged I finde no ſuch teſtimony as is mentioned: and therefore the three firſt anſwers made before unto the teſtimony from Ambroſe, may alſo ſerve for *Nazianzen*. And further that *Gregory Nazianzen* did not limit all Eccleſiaſticall power and juriſdiction unto a particular Congregation onely, it may appeare, if we obſerve, 1. How (l) he himſelf was made Biſhop of Conſtantinople, by the ſuffrages of many Biſhops met together, which is a further degree of Eccleſiaſticall authority then that (k) In orat. fun. de patr. (l) Soc. Hiſt. Ecc. l. 4. c. 21. Sozom. Hiſt. Ecc. l. 6. c. 17.

which is exercised in the Classes or Synods of these countries. II. How he pleadeth (m) from a Synodall law, touching the receyving of those that were fallen. III. How he alloweth the order of convocating and assembling neighbour Bishops about the creating of a new Bishop, affirming this to be (n) *right and according to the Ecclesiasticall law*. IV. How he in his counsell and exhortation unto the Synod at Constantinople, (o) ascribes unto them authority and power for his owne dimission and translation, for the setting of another unblameable Bishop in his place, and thereby withall for the deposition and abdication of *Maximus*, which was accordingly performed.

(m) Nazian. Epist. 1. ad Clidon.
(n) Epi. 30. ad Cæsariē.
(o) Theod. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 8.

That which might with more colour be objected out of *Nazianzen* against the use of Synods, and which is also alledged both by Mr Canne and by Mr Davenp. though not directly against the authority of Synods, is yet so brought in by the way as might cause a simple Reader to stumble thereat. The words of *Nazianzen*, as Mr Canne (p) alledgeth them, are these, (q) I *am minded* (saith he) *to shunne all assemblies of Bishops, because I never saw any good event in any Councell, that did not rather increase then diminish our evills: Their contention and ambition passeth my speech.* ANSVV. I. Observe how Mr C. mistranslateth those words of *Nazianzē*, λόγῳ κρείττονες, which he rendreth, as signifying, *passeth my speech*; whereas they signify, *prevayled more then reason*, as (r) Mr Dav. doth rightly translate them. But it is no wonder that Mr Canne should mistake that which some more learned have done before. Grosser faults are more common with him. II. As for the testimony of *Nazianzen*, the answer of *D. Whitaker* may give sufficient satisfaction; who sayth, (s) It „ may seeme strange that *Nazianzen* denyes he had seene a good issue of any Synod. „ For in those two Synods, [viz. of Nice and Constantinople, which had beene „ mentioned before,] trueth got the victory, and heresy was put downe. And „ though it be certaine, that Arianisme was encreased and grew strong and trou- „ bled the Church after the Synod of Nice, more then before, yet that is not to „ be imputed to the Synod, but to the contention and ambition of men. For as „ our corrupt nature doth more vehemently resist the knowne law of God, and „ rusheth headlong unto sinne: so falshood opposed itself more boldly unto the „ trueth then explained and openly defended, whereupon after that Synod, which „ none excelled, greater incōmodities did arise from the wickednes of men, &c. „ When *Nazianz.* saw so wicked dispositions of men, he was wholly turned from „ Councels. Although without doubt he disallowed not the thing itself, but „ the wicked indeavours of men. Now if any will reason after this manner, The „ issue of Synods is not good, or more evils follow thence; therefore Synods are „ to be avoyded: that man shall dispute deceitfully from a wrong cause, from acci- „ dent, and from the fallacy of consequent. But *Nazianzen* was to be pardoned, „ because he lived in the worst and most turbulent times of the Church, when by „ meanes of *Valens* the Emperour that degenerated from the Catholick faith, Hereticks did more prevayle, &c. Againe he opposeth *Augustine* unto *Nazianzene*, „ and sayth, It is most true which *Augustine* sayth, *Epist.* 118. that *the authority of Sy-* „ *nods in the Church of God is most wholesome*, which certainly he would not have „ sayd, if he had bene of the same minde with *Nazianzen*. And further he op-

(p) Ch. pl. p. 93.
(q) Ep. 42. ad Procop.
(r) Apo. rep. p. 225.
(s) De Cōc. qu. 1, c. 3. p. 13. 14, 15.

po-

poſeth unto the ſpeech of *Nazianz.* the teſtimony of Chriſt, ſaying, Chriſt him-
„ ſelf pronounceth and promiſeth, *Matt.* 18.20. *Where two or three are aſſembled to-*
„ *gether in his name, there he will be in the midſt of them.* In which words he ſignifyeth
„ that the aſſemblies and Synods of godly and religious men, undertaken and ap-
„ poynted for godly cauſes, are not diſpleaſing unto him. 111. The teſtimony of *Nazianzen* is as much againſt the opinion of Mr Can and Mr Dav. as againſt that which we hold touching Claſſes and Synods. For ſeeing they allow ſuch meetings for counſell and admonition, though not for exerciſe of any juriſdiction; and ſeeing the teſtimony of *Nazia.* doth extend itſelf to all kinde of aſſemblies of Biſhops, [πάνϛα συλλογον ἐπισκόπων] whether for counſell or cenſure, without exception of one ſort more then another: therefore he no more condemneth our Synods, then thoſe which my oppoſites allow.

Auguſtine, his next witneſſe, is in like manner perverted as the former. Though he in the place (t) objected, doe write that *the keyes were given to the Church*; yet doth he not thereby exclude Synods gathered together in the name of Chriſt, from having a keye of power in the judgement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. Had he proved that the title of the *Church* belongs onely to a particular Congregation in the full aſſembly thereof, and not at all unto a Synod, then had it bene ſomething to the purpoſe; in the meane time, nothing. And that the minde of *Auguſtine* was otherwiſe, it appeares by the great approbation which he (v) gives unto the uſe and authority of Synods, as being *moſt wholeſome* in the Churches of God. *D. Whitaker* (x) alledgeth often the preſence of *Auguſtine* at divers Synods. And it is recorded in the Acts of the third Councell of Carthage, where *Auguſtine* was both preſent, and ſubſcribed with the reſt unto the decrees which were then agreed upon, (y) that there ſhould be kept a yearely Synod, unto which they were to repaire out of divers Provinces; that thoſe which having controverſies with others, being called unto the yearely Synod, did refuſe to come, ſhould be held guilty, and be excluded from the communion, or excommunicated. And it is (z) noted further that the like decrees were made at another Synod held at *Hippo*, the place where *Auguſtine* lived, and that the ſame decrees were againe confirmed by another Synod at Carthage. Hence it appeares that *Auguſtine* as well as others in his time, did hold that the cauſes of particular Congregations were to be judged & decided by another Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves.

(t) De Doct. Chr. l. 1. c. 17.

(v) Epiſt. ad Ianuar. Ep. 118. De Bapt. cont. Don. l. 2. c. 3

(x) De Pont. Rom. q. 4. p. 484. & 497

(y) Magdeb. Cent. 4. c. 9. co. 866, 867

(z) Ib. Col. 870, &c.

After Auguſtine he alledgeth *Chryſoſtome*, whoſe name is alſo abuſed for confirmation of this opinion. For, 1. *Chryſoſtome* in the place alledged, viz. *De Sacerd. l. 3. c. 4.* ſpeakes of no ſuch matter as he pretends. In that whole third book I finde no one word againſt the authority of Synods. And for the fourth chapter, which Mr C. alledgeth, there is in the beſt editions of *Chryſoſtome* no ſuch chapter; they are not at all diſtinguiſhed into any Chapters: and where there is a diviſion of Chapters found, yet there is no ſuch matter to be found in that fourth Chapter. Mr Canne, it ſeemes, never read the Authours he alledgeth: for would he then have ſo falſely cited them? 11. *Chryſoſtome* is plaine for the authority of Synods. For ſpeaking of the honour due unto the Deputies or meſſengers of the Churches in Synods, he ſaith the Apoſtle, (a) *maketh his ſpeech more terrible, ſaying* in the

(a) In 2. Cor. 8. 24.

the ſight of the Churches. *He ſaith it for the glory of the Churches, for their honour. For if ye honour them, ye ſhall honour the Churches which ſent them, &c.* And then he concludeth, *This ſhall be no ſmall matter, for great is the power of a* Synod, *that is, of the Churches.* III. When as a wrongfull ſentence had bene given againſt Chryſoſtome, being unjuſtly procured by *Theophilus*, Biſhop of Alexandria, he then (b) appealed unto a *Synod of many Biſhops*, both before and after the ſentence was pronounced. The ſumme of his defence afterward was this, that he was willing to be judged by a Synod. And he complaines that his adverſaries dealt with him, contrary to the *Eccleſiaſtieall Canons*. In thoſe Canons it had bene oft decreed, that there ſhould be liberty of appeale unto Synods. IV. When *Bellarmine* pleading for the Popes authority, alledged the requeſt of *Chryſoſtome* unto *Innocentius*, Biſhop of Rome, deſiring him to write for him, that thoſe things which were unjuſtly done againſt him, might not prevayle, &c. *Chamierus* expounding the words of *Chryſoſtome*, (c) diſtinguiſheth betwixt *admonition* and *giving of ſentence*; and ſhewes that Chryſoſtome deſired an *admonition* ſhould be given by *Innocentius*, but that he exſpected *ſentence* from a Synod. *Chamier* ſayth, this is confirmed to be his meaning, becauſe he appealed to the Synod, &c. And hereby he expreſſely and diſtinctly confeſſeth that Synods have juriſdiction to give ſentence, and not onely a liberty of admoniſhing. V. When after this, *Chryſoſtome* (d) having bene both depoſed from his place, and baniſhed out of the city, was yet called back by the Emperour from his baniſhment, and was by the people deſired to enter upon his miniſtery againe, he profeſſed he might not doe it, untill his cauſe was further examined, & he proved innocent by *greater judges*, or in a *greater judicatory*, (e) ἐν μείζονι δικαστηρίῳ; wherein he acknowledged a power of Synods, not onely above a particular Congregation, but alſo of one Synod above another, as of a Generall Synod above a Nationall or Provinciall, &c. VI. The minde of *Chryſoſtome* touching Church-government, may further be knowne to us by this, that he (f) will have thoſe words, *Tell the Church*, to be underſtood of the Preſidents or Governours of the Church. And againe, ſpeaking of Prieſts or Biſhops, the Miniſters of the Goſpell, he thus deſcribeth their ſpeciall power, (g) It is granted unto them to diſ-
„ penſe the things that are in heaven: power is given unto them, which God
„ would not have to be given either unto Angels or Arch-angels: For it was not
„ ſayd unto them, *Whatſoever ye binde on earth ſhall be bound in heaven; and whatſoever*
„ *ye looſe on earth ſhall be looſed in heaven*. Earthly Princes have alſo the power of
„ binding, but of the bodies onely. But that binding by the Prieſts whereof I
„ ſpeake, remaineth unto the ſoule, & commeth up to the heavens: ſo that what-
„ ſoever the Prieſts doe below, that God ratifyeth above, & the Lord confirmeth
„ the ſentence of his ſervants. What els can you ſay this to be, but that all power
„ of heavenly things is granted unto them of God? For he ſayth, *Whoſe ſinnes ye*
„ *retaine, they are retayned*. What power, I pray you, can be greater then this one?

The next perverted witneſſe is *Baſil*, touching whom obſerve, 1. Their threefold falſe allegation, in citing three ſeverall bookes of his; viz. *Conſtit. Monach. l. 4. 14. & 6. 2. & 7. c. 35.* whereas *Baſil* wrote onely one booke with ſuch a title: and as for the 4th, 6t, & 7th, here mentioned by Mr C. there be none ſuch. What groſſe

dealing

(b) Tom. 5. Epiſt. ad Innocent.

(c) Panſtra. Cath. Tom. 2. l. 13. c. 23

(d) Socr. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 14.

(e) Edit. gr. R. Steph. l. 6. c. 16.

(f) In Matt. 18.

(g) De Sacerd. l. 3. Col. 508. Edit. Baſil.

dealing is this? II. Suppoſe it was the Printers fault that theſe bookes were thus miſalledged, and that it was but Mr Cannes overſight to let them paſſe without correction: yet even for that one book of *Monaſticall conſtitutions*, which *Baſil* did write, therein alſo is nothing to be found againſt the authority of Synods, nor any ſuch matter as Mr C. pretends. It is a great forgery and abuſe of the ancient Fathers, thus to pretend the vaile of their authority for covering of errour, when as the places pretended have not a word ſounding to ſuch purpoſe. III. That *Baſil* allowed the authority of Synods for the judgement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, it appeareth both by the praiſe which he (h) gives unto the Nicene Synod, & that for the cenſuring of Hereticks, which was an act of juriſdiction, and not of admonition or counſell onely: and againe in that he complaineth unto his great friend *Nazianzen*, touching the intermiſſion of Synodall aſſemblies, and ſaith, (i) *If we had yearely met oftner together, both according to the ancient Canons, and according to that care and ſolicitude which we owe unto the Churches, certainely we had never opened a doore unto ſlanderers.* And againe, writing unto *Athanaſius* touching ſuch meetings, he calleth them, (k) *the way of help for troubled Churches.* Thus alſo doe the Centuriſts (l) underſtand him, and alledge his teſtimony to ſhew the conſociation of many Churches in Synods, in that age.

(h) Baſil. Magn. Epi. 60. & 78.

(i) Ep. 33.

(k) Ep. 48.

(l) Cent. 4. c. 7. col. 522

The Author next objected, is alſo miſalledged: The letter of reference in the line, leades us unto a book in the margine which was not written by *Socrates*: and what place he therefore intends in *Socrates*, he muſt tell us another time. In the meane time, let it be remembred that this Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtoriographer doth plainely and plentifully record againſt my oppoſites, that the cauſes and controverſies ariſing in particular Churches were judged by another ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves, to wit, by the authority of many Churches concurring by their Deputies in Synods. This he ſhewes in the (m) condemnation of *Arius* by the Councell of Nice; in the (n) deprivation of *Photinus* by the Synod of Sirmium; in the (o) depoſition of *Neſtorius* by the Councell held at *Epheſus*; and in many other the like inſtances. If happily he intended thoſe places miſapplyed unto *Baſil* in the former quotation; he is not thereby excuſed: ſeeing in the firſt place, viz. l. 4. c. 14. there is nothing at all ſpoken of this matter; and in the two latter, viz. l. 6. 2. & 7. 35. Socrates againe declares the authority of Synods in thoſe times.

(m) Hiſt. Ecc. l. 1. c. 5

(n) L. 2. c. 24.

(o) L. 7. c. 33.

Iſidorus, it ſeemes muſt owne the quotation [*Lib. de Offic.*] which by the marginall note is aſſigned to *Socrates*; he having written two bookes concerning *Eccleſiaſticall Offices.* Theſe Mr Canne cites at large without ſpecifying either book or chapter. But in thoſe bookes of *Iſidorus*, as there be many things, which Mr C. would not be bound to approve; ſo there is nothing that with any ſhew of reaſon can be applyed againſt the authority of Claſſes and Synods. On the contrary, we may juſtly inferre that he did not there reſtraine all Eccleſiaſticall power unto a particular Congregation, as from many other, ſo eſpecially from theſe his words, (p) *Moreover that a Biſhop is not ordained of one, but of all the Biſhops of the Provinces, this is acknowledged to be appointed becauſe of hereſies; leſt by the tyrannicall authority of ſome one ordaining, they ſhould attempt any thing againſt the faith of the Church. Therefore they all*

(p) De Offi. Ecc. l. 2. c. 6

concurring, he is confirmed, and no lesse then three being present, the rest consenting by the testimony of their letters. Againe, for other of his writings, to shew his judgement in this poynt, this *Isidorus* is (q) sayd to have made a collection of all the Synods that were before his time; which booke is (r) alledged in a Synodall Epistle of the Councell of *Basil*, to prove the authority of Councels above the Pope. For his practise, he is (s) recorded to have bene President of a Synod at *Sevill* in Spaine, were he was Bishop, and as some relate, of two other at *Toledo*, wherein appeare divers actes of Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, in the exercise whereof he joyned with others, after the manner of Synodall proceedings.

(q) Cus. de Conc. Cath. l. 2. c. 3 &c.
(r) Concil. Tom. 2. p. 146, 147.
(s) Magdeb. Cent. 7. col. 261--287. & 513.

Bernard is in like manner misalledged through want of attentiõ & diligence: not onely by a wrong note of reference, but by a defective mention of his writing, *Ad Eugen.* For Bernard having written 5 bookes of *Consideration*, *Ad Eugen.* and besides them more then 30 Epistles *Ad Eugen.* he doth not specify which of these bookes, or which of these Epistles he meanes. But whether we consider those bookes, or Epistles, we finde *Bernard* in extremity opposite to *Mr Canne*, giving power not onely unto Synods, as the Ancient Fathers before mentioned, but even to the Pope himself, to judge the causes of all Churches. For living in a time of great blindenes, and height of Poperie, when the smoke of the bottomlesse pit had darkned the Sunne and the ayre, he was led aside through ignorance to exalt Antichrist; and writing unto Pope *Eugenius* that had bene his disciple, he gives him these most ambitious titles, and (t) calles him *the great Priest*, *the supreme High Priest*, *the Prince of Bishops*, *the heire of the Apostles*, Abel *in primacy*, Noah *in government*, Abraham *in Patriarkship*, Melchisedek *in order*, Aaron *in dignity*, Moses *in authority*, Samuel *in judgement*, Peter *in power*, Christ *in unction*, *&c. the onely Pastour of all flockes and of all Pastours themselves*, *&c. the Vicar of Christ*, *&c.* And though otherwise he gave many lively testimonies of a godly minde that was in him, yet not without cause is he (v) taxed for blasphemy in these unrighteous titles given to the man of sinne. More particularly, in his first Epistle which he wrote unto *Eugenius*, after he was created Pope, upon occasion of the controversy that was betwixt the Archbishop of *York*, & the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, he puts this Pope in minde that he (x) hath authority to judge the controversies that arise in other Churches, and wisheth him to use the same, and to give unto them according to their works, that they might know there is a Prophet in Israel. And writing againe (y) of the same matter; he calles the Archbishop of York, that *Idol of York*, in regard of his intrusion (he might better have entitled Eugenius the *Idoll of Rome*) & provokes the Pope, as having the fullnes of power, to cast his dart, to give peremptory sentence of deposition against the ArchB. and as the phrase of *Bernard* is, to *lighten* or *strike with the thunderbolt* of his power. The like exercise of power over those in other Congregations is often elswhere (z) allowed by him. And hereby it may appeare how grossely Mr Canne hath alledged these ancient Writers, quite contrary to their meaning, and *Bernard* in speciall, that subjects Congregations not onely to Councels and Synods, as the Fathers before alledged have justly done, but doth unjustly subject them to one person, even to the man of sinne.

(t) De Cõsi. ad Eugen. l. 2. c. 8.
(v) Whit. de Pont. Rom. q. 4. p. 425, 426.
(x) Bernar. ad Eugen. Epist. 237.
(y) Ep. 238
(z) Ad Innoc. Epist. 189. & 190.

With these testimonies of ancient Fathers Mr Canne alledgeth for his opinion,

on, that *some Councels have granted so much, and Christian Emperours by their Lawes confirmed it.* Two of these, viz. the Councell of *Nice* & *Constantinople*, he alledgeth at large, and specifyes no Canon which he intendeth for this purpose. And as for the 3d Councell of *Carthage*, whereat *Augustine* was present, I have shewed * before that it makes directly for us. That 22th Canon which he alledgeth, viz. (a) *that no Clerk be or dained without examination by Bishops, and testimony of the people*, empeacheth not the authority of Classes and Synods, but confirmeth the order established by them. And that Christian Emperours have by their lawes confirmed the authority of Synods, it is plaine and undenyable. The (b) Councell of *Nice* that condemned *Arius*, was authorised by *Constantine the Great*. The (c) Councell of *Constantinople* that condemned *Macedonius*, was authorised by the Emperour *Theodosius* the Elder. The (d) Councell of *Ephesus* that condemned *Nestorius*, was authorised by *Theodosius* the younger. The (e) Councell of *Chalcedon* that condemned *Eutyches*, was authorised by the Emperour *Martianus*. And as it was in these first Generall Councels, so may it be observed in many other. Instead of the rest, let the (f) book of Canons suffice, confirmed by *Iustinian* the Emperour; there being contained in that book many Canons, which ordaine that the causes of particular Churches should be (g) judged by Synods, and so decided by another superiour Eccleſiasticall authority out of themselves. At the end of these Canons there is added the sanction or decree of *Iustinian*, (h) by which he doth not onely allow them, and give force of lawes unto them, but with an excessive & farre greater honour then is due unto them, would have the foure Oecumenicall Councels to be receaved even *as the holy Scriptures*. Now though he offended greatly in this his esteeme of them, yet this may serve to shew what little reason *Mr Canne* had to alledge the decrees of Councels for his opinion.

* Pa. 223.
(a) Magdeb. Cent. 4. c. 9. col. 868.
(b) Sulp. Se. v. S. Hist. l. 2
(c) Sulp. S. Hist. contin. ex Sleyd. p. 162.
(d) P. 164.
(e) P. 170.
(f) Codex Canon. Ecc. Univ. edit. Christ. Iust.
(g) Can. 5. 80. 83. 85. 91. 92. 93. 96. 99. 101. 144. 187. 197
(h) Novella consti. Iust. Imper. 131.

SECT. VII.

Touching the Testimonies of Reformed Churches.

FRom ancient times they come back to the later times of Reformation, and say (a) *Touching Reformed Churches; if we may take the Confession of their faith, for testimony, then surely we have their consent also with us.* The Churches consenting with them (as they vainely imagine) are these, according to their order in alledging of them: The *Bohemian* Churches, Churches under the *Palsgrave*, the *Helvetian* Churches, the *French* Churches, Churches of the *Ausburge Confession*, of the *Low-countries*, of *Nasovia*. But the trueth is, both these and other Reformed Churches, doe condemne my oppisites, in allowing of Synods to judge the causes of particular Congregations.

(a) Ch. pl. p. 91.

The Confession of the Bohemian Churches (say they) *hath these words*, (b) *The keyes (that is, Ecclesiasticall Government) are given in trust, and granted to the Pastours, and to each severall Ecclesiasticall society*, (that is, ordinary Congregation) *whether they be small or great.* I answer: 1. This testimony is clipped by Mr Canne, who leaves out the words of order, which shew their opinion touching the originall and derivation of this power; The words of this Bohemian Confession, are that *the*

(b) Harm. Conf. c. 14.

keyes of the Lord, or this administration and power of the keyes is granted and delivered first *unto the Governours and Ministers of the Church, and then unto every Christian Congregation, &c.* Therein they doe not consent with Mr Canne, but with the opinion of *Mr Baines*, noted (c) before. And they doe there also apply these words unto *absolution* given by the Priest of the Church, as they call him. To this end they alledge those places, *Ioh.* 20. 23. *& Luk.* 10. 16. Their meaning is declared more fully before, where they (d) teach that *the pœnitent are to come unto the Priest, and to confesse their sinnes unto God before him, &c. and to desire absolution of him by the keyes of the Church, that they may obtaine remission of sinnes by such a ministery, so instituted of Christ.* This order seemes to agree with that forme of absolution described and appointed in the English booke of Common prayer, at the visitation of the sick. 11. It is acknowledged by the Ministers of the Church of the *Picards* (so called) in *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, in the (e) preface to the forementioned Confession of their fayth, that their fathers had appealed unto a Synod &c. where if any thing should be found dissonant from the Scriptures, *they were willing from the heart and lovingly to be subject and obedient to the censure and appointment of the Synod in all things.* This shewes their dissent from Mr Canne and his people. 111. The Combination of the Christian and Orthodox Churches in *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, called by themselves, *The Vnitie of the brethren in* Bohemia, doth give a cleare testimony unto the trueth touching the authority of Synods, for the government of particular Churches, and judgement of their causes by a superiour Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves, as appeareth in the booke of their Discipline; where they (f) professe that for weighty causes, in providing for the necessities of the whole *Vnitie*, or some Dioceese therein, they use to hold Synods, either Generall or Particular, &c. They alledge these 5 ends: To confirme brotherly love and concord: To strengthen them in the work of the Lord: To preserve the vigour of Discipline: To exclude scandalous persons out of the number of their Ministers, &c. To ordaine Ministers, &c. and for the (g) examination of Ministers before they be confirmed. The exercise of this authority is also declared in their (h) Visitations of the Churches which are in their *Vnitie* or consociation. This example of these brethren of the *Vnitie*, is so much the more to be regarded of us in respect of the singular providence & blessing of God, in preserving them to this day, in the midst of so many persecutions as they have endured, being more ancient then other Reformed Churches, having continued from the dayes of *Iohn Husse*, and being holpen by the *Waldenses* that were scattered into those parts; so that they (i) were increased to almost 200 little Congregations in *Bohemia & Moravia*, about the yeare 1500, before the time of *Luther*. Their piety, love, concord, and zeale of religion, notwithstanding some imperfections, appeares by their orders to be very great; in speciall, their care of sanctifying the Sabbath, bestowing it wholly in divine and religious exercises, resorting (k) foure times a day to the publick assemblies of Gods worship, even in the Winter time, and in Summer, five times a day, &c. The bond of that perfection which they seek for, and have in some measure attained unto, seemes to be their combination in Synods, and that unity therein whereupon they are denominate. Their government and the fruits thereof have bene such, that many of the spe-

(c) P. 114, 115.

(d) Harmo. Confes. Art. 5. de Pœnit. p. 241. edit. 1612.

(e) P. 219.

(f) Ratio Discip. ordinisq. Ecc. in Unitate frat. Bohem. c. 2. p. 33, 34, & 38.

(g) Ib. p. 41.

(h) Ib. cap. 6. p. 87, 88, &c.

(i) Ib. pref. p. 2, 3.

(k) Ib. cap. 3. p. 54, & 72, 73.

ſpeciall lights of Chriſtendome, ſince the time of Reformation, have admired and commended the ſame, and ſundry of them have wiſhed for the like Diſcipline and order in the Churches where they lived; as appeares by the teſtimonies of *Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Pet. Paulus Vergerius, Beza, Zanchius, Olevian, Vrſinus, Chytræus, Pet. Martyr, Calvin, Polanus*, Bucholcerus, which teſtimonies are (l) affixed unto the end of that book of their Diſcipline. Yea the printing of this book of their Diſcipline (according to their cõmon order in ſuch caſes) was not done without the (m) authority of a Synod, & namely of that which was celebrated at *Leſna in Poland, anno* 1632. they being by the preſent troubles diſperſed abroad into thoſe parts.

(l) P. 106-122.

(m) Pref. p. 8. & 16.

Unto that which he had alledged out of the Bohemian Confeſſion, Mr Canne ſaith *the Churches under the Palſgrave likewiſe conſented:* and to this end he citeth their *Publick Catechiſme in the end of part* 2. For anſwer hereunto; 1. If theſe Churches conſent unto that which the Bohemian Churches have profeſſed, then they doe not agree with Mr Can. as appeares by what hath bene ſayd in the foregoing Anſwers. 11. The place here alledged hath nothing touching the perſons to whom the Keyes are given, which is the thing for which it is produced; it ſpeakes onely of the uſe of the Keyes, and the ordinary exerciſe of Diſcipline in the Church, without reſtraining the ſame unto the ſole juriſdiction of a particular Congregation, or excluding the authority of Claſſes and Synods, either for adviſe & conſent beforehand, or for the correcting of abuſes committed in the adminiſtration of it. And that the power of a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall judicatorie, exerciſed in ſuch caſes, is agreeable unto the doctrine and practiſe of the Churches in the Palatinate, may appeare from the teſtimonies (n) before noted out of *Vrſinus, Toſſanus*, & *Paræus*, Divines of ſpeciall eminencie in thoſe Churches. 111. Whereas it is ſayd in this Catechiſme, (o) concerning Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline, that offenders after other admonitions perſiſting in their errors and wickednes, are to be *made knowne unto the Church*; leſt this ſhould be underſtood of the whole multitude, it is added preſently, *or to them that are appoynted for that matter and purpoſe of the Church: and if neither then they obey their admonition, are of the ſame men, by forbidding them the Sacraments, ſhut out from the aſſembly of the Church, &c.* The meaning is, as it is explained (p) by *Vrſinus* (who alſo yeelded ſpeciall help for the compiling of that Catechiſme) that when any is to be excommunicated, the matter be firſt heard, tryed, and judged by *the whole Preſbyterie, and that their judgement be approved by the Church; that it be not undertaken by the private authoritie of one alone, or of the Miniſters alone.* This ſerves to juſtifie what we teach and practiſe, and to condemne both the tyrannicall and popular courſes of others. 1v. Moreover for the judgement and practiſe of the Churches in the Palatinate, concerning the authority of Claſſes & Synods, which is the poynt in controverſy, it is to be obſerved, that all the Miniſters which according to order are there confirmed in the Miniſterie, are as a Jurie of ſo many ſworne men, bearing witneſſe againſt the Independencie of Churches. For at their ordination they doe not onely teſtify and promiſe by ſubſcription and giving of of the hand, but withall they doe binde themſelves by a ſolemne oath, among the reſt, (q) *to obey the Politicall and Eccleſiaſticall Lawes, the Officers and Inſpectors*, there appointed, &c. *to referre or ſubmit Church-affaires unto the Eccleſiaſticall Senate ſet over them,*

(n) P. 191, 192, 193.

(o) Qu. 85.

(p) Explic. Catech. ad Qu. 85.

(q) Churf. Pfaltz Kirchendi. beſtall. punct. Art. 16.

them, &c. and also according to the appointment of their Inspector, to frequent the Classicall assemblies, in whatsoever place or quarter they are held; willingly and freely to subject themselves unto the censure of their brethren, to deale faithfully, uprightly, and quietly in their censures & votes, to doe nothing neither for feare nor favour of any, but what they judge to be profitable for the edification of the Churches and Schooles.

The Confession of the Churches of *Switserland* or *Helvetia*, is notably falsifyed by Mr C. They confesse in the place (r) alledged by him, that the power of the Keyes ought to be committed unto select and fit persons, either by divine or by certaine and required suffrage of the Church, *or by the sentence of those to whom the Church hath delegated this office*; in which latter disjunction (omitted by Mr C.) they acknowledge another Ecclesiasticall authority besides that of a particular Congregation, about the election of Ministers. And a little after (s) this is further declared, when they acknowledge that the faulty are to be admonished, reprehended, restrained, and those that goe further astray, *by a godly agreement of such as be chosen out of the Ministers and Magistrates, to be excluded by Discipline, or punished by some other convenient meanes, so long untill they may repent and be saved.* Such an Ecclesiasticall Senate, it seemes, was among them for the government of particular Churches. And further, the authority of Synods for such purpose, is likewise specifyed and justifyed in the larger (t) *Helvetian* Confession. Besides this, we have a particular story hereof related by *Walæus* out of *Beza*, who recordes that (v) when a controversy arose at *Berne*, betwixt *Huberus* and *Abrah. Musculus*, the sonne of *Wolfg. Musculus*, touching the doctrine of Prædestination, the Rulers of *Berne*, following the order of the Apostles, did appoynt a Synod out of all the Classes within their jurisdiction, who together with the help of other excellent Teachers, called from *Zurich*, *Basel*, *Schaphuysen*, and *Geneva*, did take cognition of the differences, and after due triall according to the word of God made a conclusion; so that thereby the Churches were brought unto their former peace.

That which is next alledged by Mr C. from the *Confession of the French* (x) *Churches*, viz. the equality of all true Ministers and Churches, so that none may arrogate dominion over another, is not at all hindred by that authority which is exercised in Synods; seeing all the particular Churches united in Synods, are in like manner and equally subject unto one another, and unto that which is concluded by all. Yea this equality is confirmed by the Synodicall decree in this very Article. Whereas there be many evidences of the Reformed Churches in France, which shew what their judgement and practise is touching the subjection of particular Congregations unto a superiour Ecclesiasticall power; yet instead of many, one for the rest may suffice, which is from the (y) *Nationall Synod of Ales*, translated and published in divers languages, containing a most pregnant testimony touching this poynt of our controversie. Mr C. and W. B. doe falsely tell me of *a Jurie of more then 24 men*, which condemne my position for an errour and untrueth: but as we have seene before in the Ministers of the Palatinate, so loe here againe a Jurie indeed of more then twise 24 men, and of the most choyse Ministers and Elders of all the French Churches, and all sworne to submit unto the resolution and sentence concluded by authority of that Synod. After a proposition (z) made in

(r) Confes. Helvet. Art. 16, 17.

(s) Art. 19.

(t) Cap. 18. p. 63.

(v) Ampt der Kerckē-dien. p. 214 out of Bez. Apol. pro Justif. ex sola fide. p. 263, &c.

(x) Art. 30.

(y) Oordeel eñ uytsprake, met den Eed vā Approbatie vā het Synode Nation. der Gereform. Kerckē van Vrancrijck, gehoudē tot Ales in de Cevennes, besloten eñ gearresteert den 6. Oct. 1620.

(z) P. 3, 4.

in this Synod by *Monsr Turretin*, touching some meanes to hinder the Arminian Errours: &c. the Assembly liking wel of that motion, and much commending „ the *Synod of Dort*, as an effectuall remedie to purge the Church, and to root out „ the heresies touching the poynt of prædestination, &c. after invocation of the „ name of God they agreed that the Canons of the forenamed *Synod of Dort* should „ be read in their full assembly: which being done, and every Article seriously „ weighed, they were then by universall consent approved, as agreeable to Gods „ word, &c. Hereupon all the Ministers and Elders deputed unto this Assembly, „ did each of them severally sweare and protest, that they consented and accorded „ with this doctrine, and that they should maintaine and defend it with all their „ might unto the last breath. And to (a) make this concordant agreement the (a) P. 4. 5. „ more authentick, and to binde all the Provinces thereunto, the Assembly or- „ dained that this present Article should be printed and joyned with the Canons „ of the mentioned Synod, and that the same should be read in the Provinciall Sy- „ nods, and in the Universities, that there it might be approved, sworne and sub- „ scribed unto by the Ministers, Elders and Professours of the Universities, as al- „ so by those that desired to be admitted unto the holy Ministery, or unto any A- „ cademicall profession. And if (b) any man should reject, either in whole or in (b) P. 5. „ part, the doctrine contayned in the foresaid Synod, and defined by the Canons „ thereof, or should refuse to take the Oath of consent and approbation, the As- „ sembly ordained that the same should not be receaved unto any ministery in the „ Church, or unto any office of Schoolemaister.

The forme of oath taken first in the Nationall Synod, & afterward to be taken in the Provinciall Synods, was (c) this, (c) P. 6.

„ I N. sweare and protest before God and this holy Assembly, that I receave, „ approve, and embrace the whole doctrine taught and decided in the Synod of „ Dort, as being wholy conformed unto the word of God and the Confession of „ our Churches. I sweare and promise during my life to continue in the profes- „ sion of this doctrine, and to defend the same according to my utmost power, & „ that I neither in preaching nor teaching in the schooles, nor in writing will ever „ depart from this Rule. I declare also and protest that I reject and condemne „ the doctrine of the Arminians, seeing it doth hang the election of God upon „ the will of man, diminisheth and disannulleth the grace of God, exalts man and „ the strength of his free will to cast him downe from above, brings in againe Pe- „ lagianisme, excuseth Popery, and overthrowes the certainty of salvation. So „ truely let God help me and be mercifull unto me, as I doe before him sweare „ that which is aforesayd, without any equivocation, or evasion, or inward men- „ tall reservation.

After this followes the (d) subscription of the names of the principall lights & (d) P. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. starres of the French Churches, the Ministers and Elders deputed and sent unto that Nationall Synod from the Churches in the severall Provinces of France, as of *Picardie*, *Champagne*, *the French Iland*, *Normandie*, *Bretagne*, *Dauphine*, *Burgundie*, *Languedoc*, *Guienne*, *Poictou*, *Anjou*, and many others. Hereby the Reader may perceave what power and authority is exercised in the Reformed Churches of France;

France; that they doe not obſerve their Synods for to conclude matters by way of adviſe and counſell onely, but by their decrees and ordinances doe binde men to ſubmit unto their ſentence and judgement, excluding thoſe from the miniſtery, & profeſſions in Univerſities or Schooles, that refuſe to conſent and yeeld unto their reſolutions. Hereby it appeares how vainely Mr Canne alledgeth their Confeſſions, & perverteth them quite contrary to their meanings.

That which is alledged out of the Confeſſion of *Auſburgh*, comes not neere the queſtion betwixt us. For what though it be there affirmed (e) that *no man ought to teach publickly in the Church, or to adminiſter the Sacraments, unleſſe he be lawfully called?* This proves not that calling to be unlawfull, which is directed by an Eccleſiaſticall authority out of a particular Congregation; or that Claſſes and Synods have no right to hinder the diſordred callings of unfit perſons, when particular Churches doe offend therein. And that the Authors of that Confeſſion did approve of the authority of Synods, for the judgement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, it appeareth both by (f) their Appeale unto a generall, free, Chriſtian Councell, which they humbly requeſt and ſeek in their preface unto the Emperour, *Charles the fift:* and afterwards againe, ſpeaking of the meanes to purge the Church from abuſes, they ſay that (g) *now long agoe all good men in all nations doe deſire a Synod*: And further, *This is the uſuall and lawfull way to end diſſenſions, namely, to referre Eccleſiaſticall controverſies unto Synods. This manner the Church hath obſerved even from the Apoſtles. And the moſt excellent Emperours,* Conſtantine *and* Theodoſius, *even in matters not very obſcure, and in abſurd opinions, would yet ordaine nothing without a Synod, that they might preſerve the liberty of the Church in the judgements of doctrines. And it is moſt honourable for the Emperour to imitate the example of thoſe the beſt Princes, &c.* And therefore as in the times of *Conſtantine* and *Theodoſius*, particular Churches were ſubject unto another ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall power, that judged their cauſes and cenſured offendours; ſo they of the *Auſburg* Confeſſion, deſired the like of *Charles the fift.*

The publick order ſet forth in theſe Low countries, is in the next place alledged againſt me. But the (h) Article of the Belgick Confeſſion which is poynted at, hath nothing that ſerves their turne againſt me, neither doe they ſhew what clauſe therein they intend for their purpoſe. And what ſeemes moſt to accord with their former allegations, I haue anſwered before. But for the Synods of theſe Countries, whereas Mr C. ſaith, (i) *What thoſe Synods were of whom Mr Paget ſpeaketh in pag. 66. who decreed that particular Congregations ſhould not practiſe among themſelves, all Gods ordinances: I doe not yet know: but this I know, that no Reformed Church hath made this an Article of their faith. And therefore it is certaine, if ſuch a thing be, it was onely the invention of ſome particular men.* It is here to be obſerved, 1. That *Mr Canne* falſifyeth my words: that which I ſayd, was this, (k) *When the buſines is ſo weighty, that by former generall conſent of Churches, teſtifyed by their Deputies, meeting together in their Synods, it hath bene agreed, that the ſame ſhall not be proceeded in without adviſe of the Claſſis, ſuch as is the election of Miniſters, the excommunication of offenders, and the like*: that in ſuch *caſes ordinarily matters are brought unto the Claſſis, &c.* Now this voluntary agreement, not to proceed without adviſe of the Claſſis, before matters of ſo great

(e) Confeſ. Auguſt. Art. 14.

(f) Syntag. Confeſ. par. 2. p. 7.

(g) Ib. p. 28, 29. Confeſ. Auguſt. Art. 21.

(h) Art. 31.

(i) Ch. pl. P. 91, 92.

(k) Anſw. to W. B. p. 66.

weight

weight were determined, was not to hinder particular Congregations from the practise of all Gods ordinances among them; but onely to prevent and restraine abuses in the manner of doing, and to direct them for the better performance thereof among themselves. 11. What those Synods were, wherein such agreements were made, it had bene easy for Mr C. to have knowne, if he had used diligence in enquiry and search for them. To help him herein, let him consider these (l) plaine evidences recorded in divers Synods; viz. that men shall not proceed to election or deposition of Ministers, or excommunication of offenders, without the advise and judgement of a Classicall assembly. And besides the decrees of these Nationall Synods, the like agreements and resolutions have bene made in sundry (m) Provinciall Synods: so that from time to time, after ripe deliberation & long experience, these Acts of their Synods have still bene renewed and confirmed, from the beginning of their Reformation even unto this day.

(l) Kerckē-Ordeninge der Gereſo. Nederlāſc. Kerckē. Nation. Syno. tot Embdē, An. 1571. Art. 13, 14. & 33, 34. Nat. Syn. tot Dordr. An. 1578. Art. 4, 8. & 99, 100. Nat. Syn. tot Middelb. An. 1581. Art. 3, 4. & 62, 63. Nat. Syn. in 's Graven-Hag. An. 1586. Art. 3, 4, 5. 36, 47, 69, 70, 72. Nat. Syn. tot Dordr. An. 1618, & 1619. Art. 3, 4, 11, 12, 76, 77, 79.

(m) Provinc. Syn. tot Dordr. An. 1574. Art. 12. Prov. Syn. tot Middelb. An. 1591. Art. 3, 4, 9, 58, 68, 69.

111. Besides these generall acts and agreements of severall Synods, we have their practise also for confirmation hereof, to declare that the causes of particular Churches were judged by another Ecclesiasticall authoritie out of themselves. Thus it is witnessed, (n) that *Caspar Coolhaes* was excommunicated by the Provinciall Synod of Holland, holden at *Haerlem*, Anno 1582. that the cause of *Hermannus Herberts* was judged, and he suspended from his Ministery by a particular Synod of South-Holland, holden in the *Haghe*, Anno 1591. Novemb. 6. that *Cornelius Wiggertsz.* was also judged and excommunicated by a particular Synod of North-Holland, by reason of the errours holden by him: that (o) *Nicolaus Grevinchovius*, Minister at *Rotterdam*, was removed from his ministery by the sentence of the South-Holland Synod holden at *Delph*: that (p) *Adolphus Venator*, Minister at *Alcmaer*, that *Ioannes Valesius*, *Ioannes Rodingenus*, and *Isaacus Welsingius*, Pastours of the Church at *Horne*, were suspended from their ministery by the North-Holland Synod. and that divers others in *Gelderland*, were in like manner censured by the Synods holden in that Province at *Arnhem*, is also recorded in that historicall preface, prefixed before the Acts of the last Nationall Synod at *Dort*. And in the (q) booke itself it is likewise testifyed, that *Simon Goulartius*, Minister of the Gallo-Belgick, or Walloens Church at *Amsterdam*, was removed from his place by the Gallo-Belgick Synod. By these and sundry other like acts and sentences that might be noted, it is evident that the Synods held in these Reformed Churches, are not onely for counsell and admonition, but for the exercise of jurisdiction in censuring offenders, & judging of controversies; & that their meaning is perverted, when their Confession of faith is objected against me.

(n) Triglād. van de Moder. p. 56, 57.

(o) Act. Syn. Nat. Dordr. An. 1618. Sess. 22.

(p) Ib. pref.

(q) Sess. 22, 23.

That which Mr Canne (r) alledgeth from the Synod of *Middelburgh*, An. 1581. is also mistaken by him; there being no such thing found in that Synod as he mentioneth, touching election *done by voyces publickly in the Temple*. And if it had bene there, yet should not that prejudice the authority of Synods or Classes, in allo-

(r) Ch. pl. p. 91.

wing or cenſuring ſuch elections, either before or after they were made.

Againe it is objected, *The Synod of Tilleburgh in Naſovia, determined the like, as* Zepperus (f) *writeth*. ANSVV. The determinations of this Synod being like unto thoſe before mentioned, are therefore directly againſt my oppoſites, as the former were. *Zepperus* in his preface to the Articles agreed upon in this Synod, telles us how the Earle of *Naſſau* having ſeene the Articles of the Synod held in *Middelburgh*, Anno 1581. he took ſuch liking thereof, that in the yeare following he called the ſpeciall Miniſters of his country together unto a Synod in *Tilleburgh*, requiring that the agreements of the aforeſayd Synod might be applyed unto the uſe of the Churches under his dominion, ſo farre as they well could. Hereupon the principall concluſions thereof were receaved and confirmed among them, and ſo farre as doth ſhew their full conſent in the poynt of our controverſy, viz. that particular Congregations are to be ſubject unto an Eccleſiaſticall authority of Synods and Claſſes. Therefore it was agreed, (t) that the calling of Miniſters ſhould be made by the judgement of the Claſſis, &c. That (v) where divers examined of the Church, or of it & the Claſſicall aſſembly together, were judged to be fit, then the election was to be in the power of the Church, and to be done by ſuffrages publickly in the temple: and if they were equall, then to uſe lots, &c. This ſeemeth to be the Article which Mr C. ſtumbled at before, as if it had bene ſo written in the Synod of Middelb. 1581. which yet doth not exclude the precedent allowance of the Claſſis in ſuch elections. Moreover it was there agreed, (x) that if any complaine of wrong done in a leſſer aſſembly or Synod, he may referre the matter by appeale unto a ſuperiour Synod: (y) that no man be excommunicated without the conſent of a Claſſicall aſſembly: (z) that the depoſition of Miniſters be done by the judgement of a Claſſicall aſſembly, and conſent of the Magiſtrate. Theſe and the like Articles there concluded, doe ſhew how farre the Naſſovian Churches were from that opinion of the Brownifts, and ſome other, in denying the ſubjection of particular Congregations unto any Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves. Where could Mr C. finde more pregnant teſtimony againſt himſelf, then in ſuch reſolutions of Reformed Churches as theſe be?

(f) Pol. Ecc. p. 831.

(t) Ib. p. 833 Art. 4.

(v) P. 834.

(x) P. 837. Art. 23.

(y) P. 843. Art. 61.

(z) Art. 63.

With the former Reformed Churches alledged by Mr Canne, doe agree all the other, ſo farre as I can learne by any enquiry. For the *Church of England*, B. Jewell teſtifyeth, (a) that *we have had ere now in England* Provinciall Synods, *and have governed our Churches by home made lawes*: and he maintaineth that without wayting for a Generall Councell, it was *rather thought good to doe that which both rightly might be done, and hath many a time bene done, as well of other good men, as alſo of many Catholick Biſhops, that is, to remedie our Churches by a Provinciall Synod*. And beſides other examples, there is a (b) ſpeciall monument recording the Acts and Articles agreed upon in the Synod holden at London, Anno D. 1562. and againe of another Synod, Anno 1571. confirming the Articles of the former Synod; ratifyed by the approbation of *Qu. Elizabeth*, to be obſerved through the whole Kingdome, &c. Now howſoever there be great difference in divers Churches, touching the manner of celebrating theſe Synods; yet herein (which is the poynt of our preſent controverſy) they doe all agree, viz. that there is a ſuperiour Eccleſiaſticall au-

(a) Def. of Apol. of Ch. of Engl. par. 6. c. 17. div. 1. & 2.

(b) Syntag. Confeſ. p. 125. & 136

authority of Synods, to judge and determine the affaires of particular Congregations.

The teſtimony of the *Church of Scotland* for the authority of Preſbyteries and Synods in judging the cauſes of particular Congregations is moſt cleare. In the admiſſion of Miniſters to their offices there was (c) required not onely the conſent of the people and Church whereunto they ſhould be appoynted, but alſo *approbation of the learned Miniſters appointed for their examination.* Touching all ſorts of „ Synods among them it was concluded, that (d) they have power to execute „ Eccleſiaſticall diſcipline and puniſhment upon all tranſgreſſours and proud con- „ temners of the good order and policie of the Kirke, and ſo the whole Diſcipline „ is in their hands.

(c) Firſt book of Diſcipline, p. 29. ed. 1621

(d) Sec. b. of Diſcip. ch. 7. p. 80.

Touching Provinciall Synods, which they call the lawfull conventions of the Paſtors, Doctors, and other Elders of a Province, gathered for the common affaires of the Kirkes thereof, &c. they (e) ſay,

(e) Ib. p. 81.

„ Thir aſſemblies are inſtitute for weightie matters, to be intreated by mutuall „ conſent and aſſiſtance of the brethren within that Province, as need requires.

„ This Aſſembly hath power to handle, order, and redreſſe all things commit- „ ted or done amiſſe in the particular aſſemblies.

„ It hath power to depoſe the office-bearers of that Province for good and juſt „ cauſes deſerving deprivation.

„ And generally thir Aſſemblies have the whole power of the particular El- „ derſhips whereof they are collected.

Beſides theſe Canons and rules of their Diſcipline, there be alſo divers Actes of their Generall Aſſemblies prefixed before the foreſayd Firſt and Second bookes of their Diſcipline, which by many inſtances doe ſhew how that power of Synods was exerciſed and put in practiſe in the Church of Scotland. For example; we read (f) that there was an *Excommunication directed againſt Patrik, called B of Murray, to be executed by M. Robert Pont Commiſſioner their, with the aſſiſtance of the Miniſters of Edinburgh.* We finde there in another Aſſembly, (g) that Alexander Gordoun, B. of Galloway, being accuſed of divers offences, it was concluded, *that he ſhould make publick repentance in Sackcloth three ſeverall Sundaies, firſt in the Kirk of Edinburgh; ſecondly, in Halyrudhous; thirdly, in the Queenes Colledge, under the paine of Excommunication.* We finde in another Aſſembly, (h) that the B. of Dunkell *was ordained to confeſſe his fault publickly in the Kirk of Dunkell, for not exequuting the ſentence of the Kirk againſt the Earle of Athol.*

(f) P. 14. Edinb. Iul. 5. 1570.

(g) P. 15. Edinb. Aug. 6. 1573.

(h) P. 16. Edinb. Mar. 6. 1573.

For the confirmation of this Synodall authority, there is added in the ſame place an Act of Parliament, (i) prefixed alſo before the ſayd bookes of their Diſcipline, having this Title, *Ratification of the liberty of the true Kirk: of generall and Synodall Aſſemblies: of Preſbyteries; of Diſcipline, &c.*

(i) P. 19, 20, &c. The 12 Parl. at Edinb. Iun. 5. 1592.

The Confeſſion of fayth made by the Church of Scotland, both for the Doctrine and for the Diſcipline thereof, is yet further confirmed unto us both by generall Subſcription, and by a moſt Solemne Oath. The formall words of that Subſcription and Oath, are thus recorded unto us: (k) *We beleeve with our hearts, confeſſe with our mouth, ſubſcribe with our hands, &c. promiſing and ſwearing by that great name*

(k) Syntag. Confeſ. p. 158, 160.

name of the Lord our God, that we will continue in the Doctrine & Discipline of this Church, and that we will defend the same according to our calling and power, all the dayes of our life, under paine of all the curses contained in the law, & danger of body and soule in the day of that dreadfull judgement of God. Hereunto is annexed in the same place the Mandate of the Kings Majestie, whereby he enjoyneth all Commissioners and Ministers of the Word throughout his kingdome, that they require this confession of all their Parishioners, &c. And so farre as I can learne, even unto this day, there is still observed this substantiall and maine poynt of Discipline, namely a power in Synodall assemblies to judge the controversies that doe arise in particular Congregations. Here Mr Canne instead of a *Iurie* of 24 men to condemne my position for an errour and untrueth, as he (l) speakes, may see a *Iurie* of more then thrice 24 Congregations in Scotland, maintayning my position, and condemning his errour by their example.

(l) Ch.pl. p.83.

The Reformed Churches in *Savoy*, as that of *Geneva*, (m) and the Churches in the villages thereabout, standing under the jurisdiction of the Magistrates in Geneva, were combined together for their mutuall guidance, and the Ministers of those Churches meeting weekly together were subject to the censure of such Ecclesiasticall assemblies, and the affaires of those Churches judged therein. The knowledge of this, is so common a thing, that in appearance hereupon grew the reproach, reported by Mr Canne himself, that (n) at *Geneva subjecting of Churches to this order first began.*

(m) Kerckel. Ordon. der gemeēte van Geneven, p.9, 10, &c.

(n) Ch.pl. p.94.

The Evangelicall Churches in the greater and lesser *Poland*, in *Lithuania, Russia and Samogitia* have likewise shewed their consent with us in this poynt of subjecting particular Churches under the Ecclesiasticall authority of Synods, and have witnessed the same in divers solemne assemblies. They professe (o) that when controversies arise which cannot be compounded among themselves, the judgement and decree of a generall Synod of all their Churches is then to be required, and to be submitted unto. They agreed (p) that divers kindes of Synods were to be held among them, some greater & some lesse; that their Synodicall constitutions were to be put in execution; that the violatours thereof were to be subject unto the censures of deposition and excommunication, &c. They ordained (q) that every Evangelicall Minister was not onely to have and to read the Canons of their Synods, but also to carrie himself, and to governe the Church committed unto him according to the prescript thereof, and that under paine of Ecclesiasticall censure: that the censure of excōmunication was to be administred publickly, either in the Congregation, or in the Synod, &c.

(o) Syntag. Confes. par. 2. p. 294. Syn. Posna. 1570. Art. 19

(p) Ib. p. 300 303. Syn. Crac. Xanf. Wlodisl.

(q) P. 320-326. Syn. Toru 1595 Art. 2, 3, 7, 14, 17.

Moreover it is worthy to be remembred, how the Churches of the *Netherlands*, even at that time when they were scattered abroad in High-dutchland, and Eastfriesland, in that time of most bloody persecution, under the government of *Duke d'Alva*, did then in their banishment, and with danger of their lives at home, combine themselves in Classes for their mutuall guidance, and submitted themselves unto the judgement of such assemblies. The distribution of these Churches into severall Classes is (r) recorded publickly, as followeth. 1. Classis: The two Churches at *Franckford*, the Church at *Schoenau*, at *Heydelbergh*, at *Franckendael*, at

(r) Synod. Embd. An. 1571. Art. 10, 11.

at *S. Lambert.* II. Claſſ. The two Churches at *Collen*, the 2 Churches at *Aken*, the Church at *Maeſtricht*, at *Limburgh*, at *Nuys*, in *Gulick-land.* III. Claſſ. The Church of *Weſel*, of *Embrick*, of *Rees*, of *Goch*, of *Gennep*, and other in *Cleveland.* IV. Claſſ. The Church of *Embden*, with ſtrangers of *Brabant*, *Holland*, *Weſt-Frieſland.* V. Claſſ. The 2 Churches at *Antwerp*, the Church at *'sHertoghen-boſch*, at *Breda*, at *Bruſſel*, and others in *Brabant.* VI. Claſſ. The Church at *Gant*, at *Ronſen*, at *Oudenard*, at *Comen*, and others in *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Flanders.* VII. Claſſ. The Church of *Doornick*, of *Ryſſel*, of *Atrecht*, of *Armentiers*, of *Valencienne*, and other Churches of *Walloens.* VIII. Claſſ. The Church of *Amſterdam*, of *Delph*, other Churches of *Holland*, of *Over-Yſſel*, of *Weſt-Frieſland.* The faithfull Miniſters and people of theſe primitive Reformed Churches, the Martyrs & witneſſes of Chriſt, like the woman that fled into the wildernes from the rage of the Dragon, have given ſpeciall teſtimony unto this Claſſicall government, whereunto they ſubmitted themſelves even in thoſe hard times, when it was difficult & dangerous for them to meet together.

As the Dutch Churches practiſed among themſelves of old, ſo they in the foremention'd Synod by common adviſe agreed (f) to exhort the *Engliſh* that they would combine their Churches into a Claſſis. And accordingly this order of government was approved by them, as appeares in that booke of their Diſcipline, framed for the uſe of the *Engliſh Churches* in theſe countries; where it is ſayd in the end, (t) *This may be ſufficient for particular Congregations: for the viſitation whereof and deciſion of cauſes which cannot be ended among them, and ſuch like; Meetings, Conferences & Synods of Miniſters and Elders, choſen by particular Churches and meetings, are to be held, as the Miniſters for time and place and other circumſtances ſhall think meet.* With (v) conſent and allowance of theſe Miniſters of ſuch Claſſes or Conferences, together with conſent of the Elderſhip, were the Paſtours and Teachers of particular Congregations to be elected: and then the names of ſuch being ſignifyed to the Congregation, for inquiry after their fitnes, warning was given that if within twenty dayes no juſt exception were taken, then their ſilence ſhould be accounted as the free conſent of the Congregation, &c.

(f) Synod. Embd. art. 12.

(t) Forme of Comm. prayer, Adminiſtr. &c. printed at Middleb. 1602. the 4. edit.

(v) Ibid. p. D 7. b. & 8. a, b. & F 3. a.

To conclude, beſide the teſtimony of Reformed Churches ſeverally & apart, it ſhall not be amiſſe to behold the Harmony of their joynt conſent in the Deputies of the ſayd Churches, aſſembled together in the Nationall Synod of Dort, then which it is rightly judged, that (x) *there hath not bene for many ages paſt, any Synod more renowmed, or more holy, or more profitable to the Church.* When as the *Remonſtrants* upon pretence of partiality & ſchiſme in their judges, ſought to decline the Authority & ſentence of this Synod; the Divines of other nations, deputed from ſeverall Churches, have given ſuch judgment thereof, as ſhewes a plaine condemnation of my oppoſites opinion.

(x) Molin. Anat. Armin. præf. A 3.

The judgement of the Divines of *Great Brittaine*, who alledged the perpetuall practiſe of all Churches, was this, that (y) *the higheſt power of determining controverſies in every Church is in the Nationall Synod lawfully called together & framed &c.*

(y) Act. Syn. Nat. Dordr. Seſſ. 29. p. 97.

The judgement of Divines out of the *Palatinate*, was like unto the former: They (z) alledge the practiſe of the Church both in the old & new Teſtament,

(z) Ibid. p. 98.

for confirmation thereof; and ſhew their owne practiſe to have bene ſuch, that ſome authors of novelties *being admoniſhed firſt of their Claſſis, and then of the Eccleſiaſticall Senate, and being refractory were then diſmiſſed*, that is, depoſed from their places.

The Divines of *Haſſia* agree with the former, and upon the like grounds. They (a) ſhew the practiſe of their owne Churches; that for the repreſſing of the errour of the *Vbiquitarians*, divers Nationall Synods had bene held by authority of the foure brethren, Princes of Haſſia; and that ſince againe the Prince *Maurice, Landgrave of Haſſia*, had called another generall Synod of Haſſia, wherein the former Synodicall decrees were confirmed, & ſentence pronounced againſt ſuch as maintained contrary errours.

(a) Ibid. p. 100.

The Divines of *Switzerland* or *Helvetia*, conſent hereunto, and (b) alledge the perpetuall practiſe of ancient & later Churches, together with the practiſe of thoſe in *Berne*, in the cauſe of *Huberus*, in their owne countrey; and teſtify that by ſuch meanes peace was obtained.

(b) Ibid. p. 102.

The Divines of *Geneva* alſo (c) avouch, that in the Church, the ſupreme power of judgement is in a Synod lawfully called, &c. That God hath eſtabliſhed this order & ſanctifyed it by the example of the Apoſtles and all ages of the Church, according to the ſaying of Chriſt, *Tell the Church, &c.*

(c) Ibid. p. 102, 103.

The Divines of *Breme* (d) maintaine the ſame thing, and hold that if this order of Synods may be refuſed by ſuch as deſerve Eccleſiaſticall cenſures, that then *a doore ſhould be opened to all hereſies & ſects, & all the judgements of the Church whereunto Chriſt ſendeth us, ſhould be ſubverted, &c.*

(d) Ibid. p. 104.

The Divines of *Embden* (e) accord with the reſt, and beſides other reaſons for confirmation of Synodall Authority in the judgement of Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, they alledge that very place of Scripture, *Act.* 20. 28. which my oppoſites pervert to a contrary end againſt me.

(e) Ibid. p. 107.

Neither have they onely in generall ſhewed what the authority of Synods is, and alſo what this Synod may doe; but the Synod goes further, and proceeds unto the exerciſe of this power, and pronounceth ſentence againſt thoſe that perſiſted in their errours. In the Copie of that Sentence (f) there be divers acts of their power to be obſerved in the ſeverall expreſſions & formes of ſpeech uſed therein: „ as for example; This Synod of Dort doth ſeriouſly, inſtantly, and according „ to the authority which it hath by the word of God over all the members of their „ Churches, in the name of Chriſt require, exhort, admoniſh, & enjoyne all & „ every one of the Paſtours in the Churches of the United Provinces, Doctours, „ Rectours, Maſters in the Univerſities & Schooles, &c. The Synod, after in- „ vocation of the holy name of God, being in conſcience well aſſured of their „ authority from the word of God, following the ſteps of Ancient & late Sy- „ nods, &c. (g) Doth interdict the perſons cited unto this Synod, from all Ec- „ cleſiaſticall charge, and depoſeth them from their offices, and alſo judgeth them „ unworthy of Academicall functions, untill by earneſt repentance, &c. For the „ reſt, whoſe cognition is not come to this Nationall Synod, it committeth unto „ Provinciall Synods, Claſſes & Preſbyteries, according to the order receaved, „ that with all care they procure, &c. That they diligently take heed unto „ them-

(f) Act. Syn. Nat. Dordr. Seſſ. 138. p. 280.

(g) P. 281.

„ themſelves, that they admit not any man to the holy miniſtery, which refuſeth „ to ſubſcribe unto the doctrine declared in theſe Synodicall conſtitutions, and to „ teach the ſame: that they alſo retaine no man by whoſe manifeſt diſſenſion, &c.

This judgement & Sentence of the Synod was afterward in moſt full & ample manner (h) approved & confirmed by the Illuſtrious Lords, the States Generall of the United Provinces, acknowledging alſo the buſineſſe of this Synod to be *a great & holy work, ſuch as heretofore the Reformed Churches never ſaw, &c.* (h) Ibid. p. 282.

Beſides this Sentence pronounced againſt thoſe twelve or thirteen of the Remonſtrants, that by authority of the Synod were (i) cited to appeare before them; there is alſo another ſpeciall ſentence, (k) of ſuſpenſion from their function, concluded & pronounced againſt *Everhardus Voſculius*, and *Iohannes Schotlerius*, Miniſters at *Campen*, becauſe of their contumacy in not appearing before, the Synod, being lawfully cited thereunto. (i) Ibid. p. 16, 17. (k) P. 204, 205.

Moreover it is memorable, that the members of this Synod, the Deputies of ſeverall Churches, did all & every one of them take a moſt ſolemne oath, in teſtimony of the good conſcience which they had in the exerciſe of this authority: The forme of the Oath was (l) as followeth;

„ I doe promiſe before God, whom I beleeve and reverence as the preſent „ ſearcher of the reines and hearts, that in this whole Synodall action, wherein „ ſhalbe undertaken an examination, judgement & deciſion, both touching the „ five knowne Articles and the difficulties thence ariſing, and alſo touching all „ other matters of doctrine, I will not take any humane writings, but onely the „ word of God for the certaine & undoubted rule of faith; and that in this whole „ cauſe I ſhall propound nothing to my ſelf, but the glory of God, the peace of „ his Church, and in ſpeciall the conſervation of the purity of doctrine. So let „ my Saviour Jeſus Chriſt be mercifull unto me, whom I moſt earneſtly beſeech „ that he would continually aſſiſt me in this purpoſe with the grace of his Spirit. (l) Act. Syn. Nat. Dordr. Seſſ. 23. p. 61.

This oath being firſt taken by the Preſident of the Synod, all the other Profeſſours, Paſtours & Elders of the Netherlands, deputed unto the Synod, and then all the Divines of other nations, ſtanding up in order, did with a loud voyce every one of them declare, that they did holily promiſe and ſweare before God the ſame thing: and teſtifyed that they came with ſuch minde unto the Synod; had hitherto ſit downe therein; and would hereafter by the grace of God continue.

Having now ſuch a cloud of witneſſes conſenting with me, I have reaſon in this place againe to put Mr Canne in minde of his vaine boaſting (m) touching *a Iurie of more then 24. men* condemning me of errour. Here may he ſee a Jurie of more then thrice 24. ſworne men, and of the moſt excellent ſervants of God in ſo many Reformed Churches and Univerſities, the lights of Chriſtendome, *the flower of the Churches, and the ſelect crowne of learned men*, as they of Geneva doe (n) ſtile them, all teſtifying both by word and practiſe againſt him, and againſt the opinion of *Mr Day*. touching the juriſdiction of Synods. (m) Ch. pl. p. 83. (n) Act. Syn. Nat. Dordr. Seſſ. 3. p. 12.

A Sup-

A Supplement, annexed by the Publiſher, for anſwer unto that vvhich followveth in Mr Cannes booke.

THus farre, good Reader, the Authour hath travelled through thoſe tedious wayes, which Mr C. though with leſſe trouble, yet with more prejudice to his owne cauſe, hath firſt opened unto him. The ſumme of all is, that wading through thoſe ſtreames of Arguments and Reaſons wich Mr C. had let out upon him, he hath found ſuch as were of any depth, to runne another way; & the other too ſhallow to hinder the paſſage of trueth in this controverſie. And marching through thoſe ſeverall rankes & files of learned Authours, which Mr C. had muſtered, & brought into the field for his defence and aſſiſtance in this conflict, he hath found them all (excepting thoſe that were to be excepted) to be friends inſtead of enemies, teſtifying plainely in their owne words, & in the words of ſundry others with them, that againſt their wills they were forced to appeare under his banners. And therefore in the ſame order that he marſhalled them againſt the *Authority of Synods*, they now ſtand in aray againſt the *Independency of Churches*. There remained yet one part of Mr Can. oppoſition in this cauſe to be encountred, wherein he pretends to diſappoint and conquer ſuch forces as might ſeeme to be uſed in defence of that Claſſicall and Synodall government which he hath hitherto oppugned. To this end he (a) undertakes to anſwer certaine Reaſons or Objections, picked out of divers paſſages in the Authours (b) firſt booke, ſuppoſing by this meanes to have fully acquitted himſelf in this Diſpute. Now though there be nothing in theſe his Anſwers, for which an intelligent Reader might not eaſily ſatiſfy himſelf from what hath beene ſayd already in the foregoing Treatiſe: yet leſt Mr C. ſhould plead there was ought left untouched, that with any ſhew of reaſon required an anſwer; & for their help to whom ſuch directions may be uſefull, I have here briefly noted what he hath ſayd, and to what purpoſe.

(a) Chur. plea, p. 92.
(b) Anſw. to W.B. &c

The Reaſons or Objections which in this latter part of his booke he aſſayeth to anſwer, are 1. Concerning the evill conſequents of Independency: 2. The ancient exerciſe of the power uſed in Synodall combinations: 3. The liberty & freedome hence ariſing unto Churches & the members thereof: 4. The determinations of Synods, and conſent of Reformed Churches in this matter: 5. The Authours alledging the former practiſe of the Church where he was Miniſter. In the ſixt place he mentioneth ſome objections, of which he (c) ſaith he *will not ſtand to make any particular anſwer thereto*; but referreth us in generall to the writings of others, which whoſoever ſhall compare with the Authours words againſt which they are applyed, and duely weigh the ſeverall circumſtances on both ſides, may eaſily diſcerne that this his generall anſwer needs no reply. In the end leſt we ſhould doubt with what affection all the reſt was written, he graceth his booke with this Concluſion, and *diſireth* it *may be noted*, when out of the abundance of his charity he ſaith, *Mr Paget would faine have the Claſſicall Diſcipline advanced, that hee by it might have worldly credit alſo*: Theſe are his laſt words, uſhered with

(c) Church. pl. p. 100.

others

others of the ſame ſtamp; *that hee ſeeks to diſgrace Chriſts government, & to have his owne honoured & embraced, &c.* A vile ſlander, & not worthy to be anſwered.

For the other objections which Mr Canne pretends to anſwer, it is to be obſerved that the Authour in his former writing hath not framed any Reaſons for proofe of this poynt in controverſie, as he hath often (d) before noted in this Treatiſe. It was not his purpoſe at that time to propound any Argument, firſt or laſt, but being the Defendant or partie accuſed, to wait for the Arguments of his Accuſers. And ſo much was alſo ſignifyed in his (e) other booke, which Mr C. had read, and from whence thoſe Reaſons or pretences, as he calles them, are taken, unto which here he ſhapes his Anſwers. Yet notwithſtanding he will take no notice of this, but runnes into two contrary extremes; before he affirmed that he brought no proofes, becauſe he had none to bring; intimating (f) that he *hath not left this point unprooved, out of forgetfulnes; but rather of meere poverty, as not having any authenticall records, &c.* Here againe he makes him to bring Reaſons & Arguments, when as he profeſſed that at that time he intended to bring none: not out of forgetfulnes, or want of ability; for he had ſayd in the place before mentioned, that he had to this purpoſe *in his Sermons divers times alledged ſundry evidences & grounds of holy Scripture, &c.* And Mr C. knew that he was able to produce ſuch evidences, by the occaſionall mentioning of thoſe two places, *Deut.* 17. & *Act.* 15. which he hath alſo undertaken to anſwer. Come we now to the particulars.

(d) Pag. 40, 73. 168.

(e) Anſw. to W. B. p. 71. 88.

(f) Chur. pl. p. 15, 16.

I. THe firſt pretended Reaſon is ſet downe by Mr C. in theſe words: *If particular Congregations ſhould not ſtand under any other Eccleſiaſticall authoritie out of themſelves, manifold diſorders, confuſion and diſſipation of Churches would follow.* Thus he perverts the Authours words, which were not ſet downe by way of Argument, but meerly as a declaration of his judgement touching the benefit of Claſſes and Synods, againſt the contrary accuſation of his oppoſites. His words are theſe, (g) *That ſingle uncompounded policie (as Mr Iacob calles it) whereby particular Congregations are made to be independent, not ſtanding under any other Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves, that I conceive to bring with it manifold diſorders, confuſion and diſſipation of Churches.* That which the Authour thus ſet downe as his owne opinion, which he held concerning the ſafety of this government, for the maintaining of order & ſetled peace in Churches; that Mr C. tranſformes into an Argument, & calles it his *firſt reaſon.* The Authour had juſt cauſe to mention that conſideration in ſuch manner as he did, to ſhew the importance of this point in controverſie, by which he there alſo hoped that others would be warned, to *take heed what new formes of Churches and Church-government they frame unto themſelves, or commend unto others.* Experience hath taught, not once, nor twice, that in the matter of framing Churches, for want of taking ſuch advice, ſome have become like Vtopian Commonwealthsmen; going to work according to their owne *Idæas*, they have begun a work which they were not able to finiſh; not unlike unto that builder of whom our Saviour ſpeakes, *Luk.* 14. 28, 29, 30. And therefore, as before more briefly, ſo now (h) at his entrance into a more full and profeſſed handling of this queſtion, the Authour hath hereby declared of what importance this controverſy is, and given inſtance in the diſorders, confuſions and diſſipations which have hap-

(g) Anſw. to W. B. Pref.

(h) Pag. 32, 33.

pened unto that Church of the Brownists at Amsterdam, the rather because of their neglect and contempt of such remedies, as from Classicall and Synodall government might have been afforded unto them. If those that pretend such accurate exercise of Discipline, have fallen into so great and manifold scandals, such rash and offensive excommunications, schismes, & depositions, as are there mentioned; how can it be expected that others, in outward appearance more unable to mannage such a kinde of government, should be free from running into the like or greater offences? If some few single Churches, within a few yeares, have bewrayed to their losse and shame, the great want of a combined government, for the establishment of peace and order among them; how many instances and examples of the same kinde might we looke for in processe of time, where many Churches together should be erected according to this modell of Independent politie? To this purpose the Authour hath applyed that observation touching these evill consequents of Independency; not by way of argument, as Mr C. hath set it downe. If he had intended to propound an Argument, he would have framed it after another manner, for the aggravation of their errour; as thus for example: *That independency of Churches, which not being prescribed of God, doth occasion manifold disorders, &c. that is so much the more to be avoyded: But such is that Independency which is required of these Opposites: Ergo.* Or thus; *That Independency of Churches, which not by accident onely, but in the very nature thereof, is a proper cause of manifold disorders, is to be condemned: But such is that Independency taught by these Opposites: Ergo.* The Argument thus propounded, and understood principally of more Churches of this frame seated together (where the disorders ensuing would be more apparent, and the neglect of the remedy more culpable) hath sufficient grounds, both of Scripture and Reason, to uphold it. First, there being required a communion betwixt Churches, as well as betwixt members of one Church, as hath been noted (i) before; and seeing God is not ἀκαταστασίας ὁ Θεὸς, the author *of confusion*, or of unquietnesse, *but of peace*; and will have all things *done decently & in order*, specially in the *Churches of the Saints*: 1. Cor. 14. 33, 40. hence we may conclude that such formes of government as doe unavoydably tend to disunion and disorder, are not the Ordinances of God. Secondly, the principles of nature & common equity, as they may be read in the practise of all times and places, doe teach that no humane societies can subsist together without these bonds of combination & confederacy; whereby it comes to passe that families unite themselves and grow together into greater Corporations, Cities, Provinces, Commonwealths, and Kingdomes, for their mutuall peace and safety in the way of government. The subordination of Courts in Civill government, while they are framed according to an Aristocraticall temper, is not repugnant unto the nature of Ecclesiasticall politie. These things thus premised, and applyed unto Classicall and Synodall combinations, it may hereby appeare how Mr C. hath played the trifler in so many idle and impertinent answers which he hath made unto his owne frame of reason obtruded upon the Defendant. But for further satisfaction, behold the substance of his Answers.

(i) Pag. 109.

I. C. Answv. I. *When God hath established an order for the administration of his*

owne

owne house, what presumption of man dares change it? Thinkes he that he is wiser then the Almighty? &c. REPL. I. This answer saith nothing to any part of the proposed argument, even as he himself hath framed it; unlesse it be a denyall of the Conclusion. For of changing an order that God hath established, there was no mention, nor colour of any such meaning, in the Authors words which he undertakes to refute. Onely the question is whether Independency be that forme of administration which God hath appointed unto his Churches: This Mr C. with vehement asseverations affirmes, and complaines of them that deny it. If this reasoning were good, he might easily beat downe all objections that are made against his Tenet. II. Observe with what insolent language he inveigheth against those that oppose his opinion, as if they did set themselves poynt blanck against that which they saw to be the ordinance of God. Did he thinke the Authour or others of his minde, meant to plead in such manner for their judgement & practise touching Classes and Synods? Sure Mr C. knew it to be otherwise; at least by those places of Scripture, which he saw mentioned in their defence. But herein also he shewes himself to be a disciple and follower of *H. Barrow*, who for the same thing reproaching the *Reformists*, sayth (k) they *would bring in a new adulterate forged government in shew, or rather in despite of Christs blessed government, which they in the pride, rashnes, ignorance, and sensualitie of their fleshly hearts, most miserably innovate, corrupt and pervert, &c.* Mr C. doth here in like manner multiply words to the same purpose.

(k) Discov. p. 189, 190.

I. C. ANSVV. II. *Be it well considered, that God alwayes abhorreth all good intentes of men, that are contrary to the good pleasure of his will, revealed in his word, &c.* REPL. I. There is no mention made of any *intentes* in the supposed Reason: it is onely sayd that Independency will be attended with disorders and confusion, &c. Mr C. therefore disputes with his owne intentes in these his impertinent answers. II. How can God be sayd to *abhorre good intentes*? Or how can those be sayd to be *good* intentes, that are *contrary* to the revealed will of God? III. Intention notes the purpose of the will, with reference both unto the end at which it aimes, and the meanes by which it endeavours to attaine that end. If both these be good & lawfull, the intention also is absolutely good. Yet if the end be good, though the meanes be unwarrantable, the intention is not presently abhorred, but sometime commended of God himself; as in David, when he purposed to build an house for the Name of the Lord, 1. *King.* 8. 18. *with* 2. *Sam.* 7. 7. But in this case, on their part that maintaine Classicall and Synodall combinations, not onely the end they aime at, to wit, peace, order, and the establishment of Churches; but the meanes also, or the practise of such combinations, is allowed by the word of God: neither doth Mr C. proove ought to the contrary.

I. C. ANSVV. III. *This objection taken up here by Mr Paget, is the very same which the Papists, and those that way affected use, &c.* REPL. I. If Papists use the *very same* objection, that is, if from the same Premisses they make the same Conclusion, rejecting Independency & Anti-Synodall courses, because of the confusions and disorders which doe follow the same; then herein they are no Papists, forasmuch as Protestants have reasoned in like manner, as may be seen in sundry Testi-

monies before (l) alledged. II. When Papists dispute against any lawfull forme of government, with the same argument which we use against that which is unlawfull; this can no more prejudice our reasoning then it doth Mr Cannes, while both he & they reason against lawfull Synods, as taking away that right and power which they pretend to be due unto others; he ascribing that to the body of the Congregation, which they doe (m) to the Pope, viz. the supreme Ecclesiasticall judgement of all controversies; and both pleading from the same grounds of Scripture, *Math.* 16, & 18, &c. Men may use the like arguments, & yet their conclusions be farre unlike & contradictory.

(l) Ch. 7. Sect. 2–7.

(m) Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 1. & de Verb. Dei. l. 3. c. 5.

I. C. ANSVV. IV. *If particular Congregations must loose their right and power, because of the offences, which some men have committed in the exercise thereof. Then surely by the same reason (if Mr Pagets reasoning be worth any thing) ought Classes and Synods, to lay downe that superiour authority, which they have taken over many Churches; because they in many things, many times have offended, in and about the execution.* REPL. I. The reason here mentioned by Mr C. is a meere fiction and forgerie of his owne. The Author never reasoned on this manner: he never sayd, never thought to say, that particular Congregations *must loose their right & power, &c.* There is no shadow of any such thing in those words which Mr C. hath here set downe for himself to answer. II. Particular Congregations doe still retaine their due right & power, even while they are subordinate unto the superiour authority of Classes and Synods, as hath been often shewed (n) before. III. If he would have spoken to the purpose, he should have shewed, that particular Congregations, standing under no other Ecclesiasticall authority out of themselves, are not thereby exposed to manifold disorders, confusion, and dissipation: Or if he would have retorted this argument upon the Defendant, he ought to have prooved that Classicall and Synodall government, of its owne nature, brings with it manifold disorders, confusion, and dissipation of Churches. But instead of this, he mentioneth onely the offences which *in many things, many times* have been observed, *in & about the execution.* And behold what he saith for proofe hereof.

(n) Pag. 156, 157, &c. 164, &c.

I. C. *And this I am sure no good Christian will deny, I could give divers instances for it; but it needs not: Onely it is not amisse to set downe* Nazianzens (o) *words; who was an Elder or Bishop:* I am minded, *sayth hee*, to shunne all assemblies of Bishops, because I never saw any good event in any Councell, &c. *Whither things are better caryed now, then they were in his time, I will not, nor am able to judge.* ANSVV. I. If he will not nor cannot judge whether the same abuses be now committed which *Nazianzen* complained of; it followes that he ought not to have the will nor ability to conclude that this government should now be removed, as it seemes he would inferre from such a reason as was used by *Nazianzen* for his dislike of the Synods of his time. II. This testimony of *Nazianzen* hath been sufficiently answered (p) before out of *D. Whitaker*, where it hath been also shewed, that it makes as much against those Assemblies of Bishops which Mr C. himself allowes, as against any other. But to make it appeare that this is no new objection, & that we need not seek any further answer unto it, loe here what others have sayd touching the same testimony. *Beza*, among other counsels to the Emperour & States

(o) Epist. 42. ad Proc.

(p) P. 222, 223.

of

of Germany, for the ſettling of the peace of Chriſtian Churches, doth ſpecially give advice for the celebrating of a Synod: & ſeeing he doth not onely anſwer the foreſayd exception, but withall notably declare the lawfull, ancient, and profitable uſe of Synodall authority, I have here ſet downe his words at large, as worthie „ our obſervation for this purpoſe. Churches, (q) ſaith he, cannot be rightly „ governed by their Paſtours, unleſſe beſide the ſowing of good ſeed, they doe „ alſo by the word of God, as with a ſickle cut downe evill herbes, yea & root „ them out according to their power. But becauſe that cannot oftentimes be performed by the authority of one or a few, neither happily were it meet: therefore „ ſince Churches began to be ſettled, the Biſhops of the Provinces did meet together as often as there was need: and that according to the example of the „ Apoſtles, leſt any ſhould think this hath been the device of man. The Synod „ of the Church of Jeruſalem and Antiochia, celebrated in the Actes of the „ Apoſtles, is well knowne. Afterwards followed that firſt Oecumenicall Synod of Nice, where Eccleſiaſticall Provinces being more accurately then happily divided, this alſo was ordained, that every yeare two Provinciall Synods „ ſhould be gathered by the Metropolitanes: which cuſtome if it had bene diligently obſerved, certainly it is likely that many and moſt great calamities of the „ Church might have bene prevented. But here ſome doe object unto us, that „ for the moſt part diſſenſions have been rather kindled then quenched by theſe „ Synods, inſomuch that the famous Biſhop *Nazianzene* by a certaine ſentence of „ his hath as it were, condemned all thoſe aſſemblies. But we make no doubt „ to oppoſe unto this opinion, partly that Apoſtolicall example, and partly alſo „ the hiſtorie of things done. Indeed the Nicene Synod hath not quite allayed „ the furies of Arius, no nor ſome that followed after. But who ſhall therefore „ judge that there hath been no fruit of that Synod, which even at this very time „ we doe abundantly reap? Yea that Apoſtolicall Synod hath not altogether reſtrained Cerinthus and thoſe obſtinate maintainers of Circumciſion. But who „ would therefore deny that it was neceſſary for the Church? Therefore every „ one ſees that that ſentence of *Nazianzene* doth not concerne Synods rightly ordered, unleſſe we thinke that he would detract from the Synod of Nice: which „ indeed is very abſurd, ſeeing it is well knowne how great a defender he hath „ been thereof. If nevertheleſſe Arians ceaſed not to rage through the world, „ how much the more may we thinke that they would have done it, if the authority of that holy Synod agreeing whith the word of God, ſo often objected „ againſt them, had not repreſſed their renewed endeavours? The ſame we avouch „ concerning the Macedonians, Neſtorians, Eutychians, and their iſſue, whom „ as many Oecumenicall Synods, if not with one wound, yet with reiterated „ blowes have by the word of God ſtricken downe, inſomuch that they doe „ afford us armes againſt the ſame, ſpringing up againe in this our age. Yet when „ we ſay theſe things, we doe not hold that the Church is grounded upon the authority of ſuch Aſſemblies, or that all Conventicles, by whatſoever name they „ be called, are to be accounted Synods: but this one thing we ſay, that God is „ to be intreated by us in theſe calamities of the Church, that we may duely and „ holily

(q) Conſtt. ad Cæſ. & Stat. &c. Tract. Theol. vol. 2. p. 111, 112.

,, holily uſe theſe remedies alſo which are given unto us of God. Thus farre *Beza*. The ſame objection out of *Nazianzene* is to like purpoſe anſwered by *Vrſi-*

(r) Admon. de lib Concord. c. 12. Op. tom. 2. col. 686.

,, *nus*, when he ſaith, (r) The complaint of *Nazianzene*, that he ſaw no good iſſue ,, of any Synod, we make no generall rule; unleſſe we would condemne the Or- ,, thodoxe Oecumenicall Councels of the ancient Church, to have had an evill ,, event; which *Nazianzene* doth not ſay, who ſpeakes of the Synods of his time, ,, whereof ſome were Arian [Synods,] ſome perhaps confuſedly undertaken & governed. *Sibrandus Lubbertus* ſpeaks in like manner touching the ſame teſti-

(f) De Concil. l. 1. c. 1.

,, mony of *Nazianzene*, ſaying, (f) This unhappines of the events muſt not be ,, aſſcribed unto the Councels themſelves; but to the ambition & deſire of com- ,, mand in thoſe that aſſemble, as the ſame *Nazianzene* doth alſo teſtify.

I. C. ANSVV. V. *If the infirmities of the people, be a good reaſon to take away their liberty, in practiſing among themſelves all Gods ordinances: then the contrary vertues, which oftentimes have bene found in them (as in ſtaying the rage of the Scribes & Phariſies* (t); *in preferring ſincere Chriſtians before Arrians* (v); *& being themſelves ſound in the faith* (x); *when their Miniſters have bene Heretickes:) is a good reaſon to maintaine their liberty ſtill.*

(t) Mat. 21. 26. Act. 3. 26.
(v) Zezom. l. 7. c. 7.
(x) Theod. l. 2. cap. 7.

REPL. 1. This anſwer is beſide the queſtion, which is not here touching the peoples liberty, as they are diſtinguiſhed from their Miniſters; but concerning particular Congregations and their ſubjection to Eccleſiaſticall authority out of themſelves. Though Mr C. and ſome others that now ſtrive for the Independencie Churches, doe alſo affect a popular way of government in the Church; oppoſing not onely the power of Claſſicall Preſbyteries, but alſo of particular Elderſhips; yet Popularity doth not neceſſarily follow upon Independency, neither have they alwayes both the ſame Patrons. *Mr Iacob*, though he pleaded for a ſingle uncompounded policie, in oppoſition to Synodall authority; yet he utterly diſliked thoſe popular circumſtances held by the *Separation*, as hath been noted (y) before. Againe, the *Anabaptiſts*, though they maintaine and practiſe thoſe popular wayes of judging cauſes among them, and (z) oppoſe the Elderſhips of the Reformed Churches, as exerciſing an undue power, in deciding matters apart from the Congregation; yet they allow and practiſe divers things, contrary to the nature of Independencie, ſo as Mr C. pleades for it: ſeeing, 1. They have (a) their Biſhops, as they call them, diſtinct from their other Preachers, by them termed *Vermaenders*, that is, Admoniſhers; and by ſome of them (b) held to be Deacons: theſe acknowledge themſelves (c) to be inferiour to their Biſhops in the miniſtery. The Biſhops belong to ſome more eminent Congregations of that Sect, doe at certaine times viſit the other leſſer Congregations, and adminiſter the Sacraments among them. 2. The Anabaptiſts (d) uſe to excommunicate whole Congregations at once, when having been of the ſame profeſſion with them, they witneſſe their diſſent from them in ſuch matters as for which particular perſons are excommunicated by them. 3. The cauſes that cannot be determined in their particular Congregations, are by them ſometimes (e) referred to the judgement of Arbiters, men of ſeverall Congregations, choſen by both parties, with promiſe to ſtand to their ſentence, & ſometimes alſo to the meetings of the Officers of ſundry Churches. This ſhewes that though they plead for Popula-

(y) Pag. 176.
(z) Protoc. Embd. Act. 101. n. 1. q. 7. Cl. Cl. Bekent. p. 218. Cloppenb. Cancker der Weder-doop. p. 535.
(a) Faukel. Babel der Wederdoop. pag. 166, 167, 190.
(b) Protoc. Embd. Act. 78. n. 4. & Act. 80. n. 2.
(c) Geſprec tot Zierickz. p. 21.
(d) Protoc. Embd. Act. 99. n. 1. Fauk. Babel der Wederd. D a. & p. 215.
(e) Babel der Wederd. C4. a. & C6. b.

ritie,

ritie, yet they doe not ſimply allow of Independencie. 11. Suppoſe that conſideration had been alledged by the Authour againſt Popular government alſo, as juſtly it might, in regard of the *manifold diſorders, confuſion, and diſſipation of Churches*, which it is knowne to bring with it; yet this anſwer cannot proove it to be inſufficient, becauſe it runnes upon a twofold falſe ſuppoſition; 1. That this appertaines to the due liberty of the people, to have their judgement ſought unto for the determining of all controverſies that ariſe in the Church: 2. That this liberty is acknowledged to have been taken from them, as if they had been once in full poſſeſſion of it; or that this is the maine reaſon for denying that pretended liberty to the people, becauſe of their infirmities or miſcarriages in the uſe of it. Theſe things as they are untrue in themſelves, ſo they are unjuſtly obtruded upon the Defendant, who had given no occaſion to ſuch pretences. We maintaine on the other ſide, that this is no part of the peoples priviledge, becauſe it is not due unto them by any divine warrant: and herein we are further confirmed, ſeeing ſuch an order is in outward appearance, and according to undenyable experience, in the Anabaptiſts, Browniſts, & others, attended with manifold diſorders, confuſion & diſſipation of Churches. 111. Though it were granted that the people have beene oftentimes wiſer in their choyce, & ſounder in the faith then their Miniſters (which yet three of thoſe places (f) here alledged doe not proove, there being nothing in them to that purpoſe for which they are cited;) yet that is not enough to diſprove the foreſaid aſſertion, unleſſe he could ſhew that ordinarily they are ſo qualifyed, & indued with ſuch abilities as are requiſite for the orderly exerciſe of judiciary power in the Congregation. This is not onely contrary to experience, but alſo to the revealed will & wiſedome of God, in diſpenſing his gifts ſeverally unto the members of the myſticall body of his Church, appoynting ſome to be of meaner uſe, and in ſubjection to others. 1. *Cor.* 12. 14--31. *Heb.* 13. 17. We muſt either ſtraiten the limits of the Church, further then Chriſt himſelf hath allowed us, by ſhutting the weak & feeble out of his fold; or elſe acknowledge that all the members are not fit to be uſed in the judiciall trying & determining of cauſes.

(f) Act. 3. 26. Zozo. l. 7. c. 7. Theod. l. 2. c. 7.

THe next thing that Mr C. (g) pretends to anſwer, is touching the Antiquity of Claſſicall and Synodall government, from thoſe words of the Authour, that *the power which the Claſſis exerciſeth is ancient, &c.* that he names it *the old beaten path, &c.* The Authour indeed had uſed theſe words, upon juſt occaſion; not as any reaſon or argument, to juſtify the lawfulnes of this power, as Mr C. ſeemes to inſinuate; but to declare the trueth in the matter of fact, rather then in the controverſie of right: and this may eaſily appeare to thoſe that looke upon the places (h) alledged out of the Authours book. When an unjuſt complaint was made, that *he had ſubjected the Church under an undue power of the Claſſis*, that *he brought it under, &c.* he anſwereth, *That power which the Claſſis exerciſeth is ancient; the ſame power which they had long before I either knew them or they me; &c.* Againe when there was mention made of *thoſe of his ſide*, he anſwered, *For my part I abhorre this ſiding; I deſire to walk in the old beaten path of that diſcipline and government, practiſed by theſe Reformed Churches, and eſtabliſhed in their Claſſes and Synods: &c.* Was not here juſt cauſe

II.

(g) Chur. pl. p. 94.

(h) Pag. 72. & 105.

to

to use these words to this purpose for which they are applyed? He speakes chiefly of the antiquity of this government, in regard of the state of that particular Church, & of those with which it is combined; concerning which Mr C. himself cannot deny but that he hath spoken the trueth. But suppose it were uttered in generall, with reference unto the joynt consent of the Churches in all ages, giving testimony unto the exercise of this power; might not this be a weighty & profitable consideration, to be commended unto the serious thoughts of those that offer to oppose it? Let us heare what Mr C. saith to this.

I. C. ANSVV. I. *Sundry errours are as ancient as the Apostles time, &c.* REPL. 1. This doth not prejudice the constant practise of this or any other trueth, nor the regard that is to be given unto the *custome of the Churches of God*, according to the direction of the Apostle, 1. Cor. 11. 16. To what end else are those manifold proofes and Allegations, which Mr C. hath taken from Authours of all times, to shew, as he (i) pretends, their *consent with him*, and that his opinion *may not be thought a Noveltie?* 11. The due power of Classes & Synods is not grounded upon the ancient exercise of it; neither is this made an argument to prove the lawfulnes thereof: It is onely alledged to shew that others also, professing subjection unto the Ordinances of Christ, have in like manner understood the divine warrant for the exercise of such government in the Church. The Antiquitie whereupon the lawfulnes of this combined politie doth rest, is that which it claimeth from the Law and the Gospel, as hath been shewed (k) before.

(i) Ch. pl. p. 77--81--89. &c.

(k) Ch. 2, 3, 4.

I. C. ANSVV. II. *Howsoever Mr Paget for the credit of his cause, names it the old & ancient Discipline; yet sure I am, to proove it so, he never will nor can. There are many (and I think hee knowes it) which doe affirme that the Ecclesiasticall government by Classes and Synods, is a weed that grew many yeares after the Apostles*, A late devise (l), and that in all antiquitie there doth not appeare any one step thereof (m); Also that at Geneva, subjecting of Churches to this order first began (n). And before Calvin came there, everie Congregation was free in itself (o). REPL. 1. These testimonies doe not speak of *Synods*, and the Ecclesiasticall authority exercised by them. What trueth is there then in Mr Cannes words when he sayth, they *affirme that the Ecclesiasticall government exercised by Classes and* Synods *is a weed, &c.* 11. The distinction which these Authours make betwixt *Classes* and *Synods*, as it is ungrounded and insufficient to prove the one lesse lawfull or ancient then the other; so it can least of all serve Mr Cannes purpose: seeing the chief cause why they disallow *Classes*, is because they exclude Hierarchicall authority; not simply because they exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdictiō, which is the maine ground whereupon Mr C. doth oppose them. 111. The place quoted out of *D. Bilson*, where he objecteth unto some their *owne device*, is not properly directed against Classicall government; and he seemes to intend it principally against Lay-Elders, as they call them, as appeares by that which followeth (p) in his book. But to shew how farre he was from uttering any thing, that might either disprove the ancient use of Synods, or favour independent Church-government, and the pretended antiquity thereof, mark what he saith elswhere; (q) There is no Christian Realme nor Age, wherein the use of Synods hath not bene thought needfull, &c. as appea-

(l) Bilson perp. gov. c. 16. p 387

(m) Sutclif. Discipl. c. 8. p. 138.

(n) Bancroft surv. c. 22. p. 353. Comp. Ch. p. 91, 93, 94.

(o) Hook. Ecc. Polit. Pref.

(p) Perpet. Gov. p. 388

(q) Ibid. p. 376.

„ appeareth by the Councils that have bene kept in all kingdomes and countries „ since the Apostles times, when any matter of moment came in question, which „ are extant to this day; and likewise by the Synodes that every Nation and Pro- „ vince did yearely celebrate, according to the rules of the great Nicene & Chal- „ cedon Councils, which cannot be numbred, & were not recorded, &c. And „ unlesse you give the Pastor and Presbyters of every Parish full & free power to „ professe what religion they best like, to offer what wrongs they will, to use „ what impiety and tyrannie they themselves list, without any restraint or redresse, „ which were an heathenish, if not an hellish confusion; you must where there is „ no Christian Magistrate, &c. yeeld that libertie to the Church of Christ, which „ every humane society hath by the principles of nature, to wit that the whole „ may guide each part, & the greater number overrule the lesser, which without „ assembling in Synode cannot be done. Againe he professeth his judgement touching the danger and noveltie of Independencie, when he saith, (r) In que- „ stions of faith, matters of faction, offers of wrong, breach of all order & equitie, „ shall each place & Presbyterie be free to teach & doe what they please, without „ depending on or so much as conferring with the rest of their brethren? Call you „ that the Discipline of Christs Church, & not rather the dissolution of all peace, „ and subversion of all trueth in the house of God? I thinke you be not so farre „ beside yourselves, that you strive for this pestilent kinde of anarchie to be „ brought into the world. Our age is giddie enough without this frenzie to put „ them forward. Howbeit we seek not what new course you can devise after „ fifteen hundred yeares to governe the Church; but what meanes the antient „ and primitive Church of Christ had, before Princes embraced the trueth, to „ assemble Synodes & pacifie controversies, as well touching Religion as Eccle- „ siasticall regiment, &c. IV. The words cited by Mr C. out of *D. Sutcliffe*, against Glasios, are expressely answered by *Mr Parker*, when having set downe the objection here mentioned, viz. that *in all antiquitie there doth not appeare one step „ of these Classicall assemblies*, he sayth, (f) What, not so much as a step? there is a „ step at least extant in the Canonicall law throughout, but specially (that we be „ not altogether silent) *Decret. par. 2. cap.* 11. *q.* 3. *c.* 4. & in the Councils every where, „ in that of Sardica, *Can.* 17. of Africa, C. 127. of Laodicea, C. 12. whence „ it appeareth that according to ancient custome neighbour Bishops were „ alwayes wont to come together, in all sorts of difficult cases: which the Pres- „ byters at Rome judged to be so necessary, that a firme decree could not be „ made in the farre-spread cause of those that were fallen, without the assem- „ bling of those that were neer unto them, *Cypr. L. 2. Epist.* 3. which course „ Cyprian himself also followed, *L.* 1. *Ep.* 8. & Cornelius Romanus, *L.* 3. „ *Epist.* 11. Why doe I spend time? There is nothing more evident to him that is „ acquainted with the ancient monuments of history, then that neighbours „ (even besides the Synod) did oftsoone meet together for deciding of strifes, „ for ordinations, for dissolving of doubts, & in summe, for every weighty bu- „ sinesse. Of which assemblies the Epistles of Cyprian are full. And these assem- „ blies what are they els but Classicall assemblies? The exceptions that might be

(r) Ibid. p. 378.

(f) De Polit. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24. p. 355.

made against these things are further answered by *Mr Parker* in the same place. It had behooved Mr C. to have refuted Mr P. herein, if he would have us give credit to this assertion of *D. Suel.*

v. The testimonies next alledged touching *Geneva*, as they are untrue in regard of the state of those Churches, so they are unjustly applyed against Classes and Synods; seeing as *Mr Par.* sayth, and acknowledgeth with *D. Suel.* that (t) *Geneva hath neither Classes nor Synods, because their territorie is so small that it is not capable of them.* Yet that they of *Geneva* doe allow the use of Classes and Synods, *Mr Parker* hath there manifested from their writings, and the confessions of their adversaries; and it doth also appeare by their practise, while their joynt Presbyterie doth not greatly differ from a Classis. But to speake properly, it is not a Classis, and to speak truely, they are not the first that have approved and practised such kinde of combined government. But lest Mr C. should seeme to urge us with the testimonies of these Authours, behold what proofes he addes to this purpose.

(t) Ibid. p. 361, 362.

I. C. *Touching these Assertions: I cannot see how Mr Paget, or any other is able to disproove them. It is acknowledged, on all sides, that in the first hundred yeares after the Apostles, Ministers and Brethren of sundry Congregations, met sometimes, to conferre mutually together of common Church-affaires; yet so as every particular Congregation, had always (as the Centuries (v) write) power and authority in themselves, to chuse their Officers, reject Heretickes, excommunicate offenders, and the like.* Answv. I. There is nothing here sayd to proove the foresaid assertions, but what is grounded upon a false supposition, which the Authour hath before (x) often discovered; viz. that particular Congregations have not still their power & authority in elections and censures, when they are combined with others, & subject to the power belonging to such combinations, for their direction, & correction, in case they offend. Mr C. leaving this without proofe, the assertions which he offers to maintaine, are in like manner left without defence, for ought he hath here sayd. II. The *Magdeburgenses* never understood that the consociation of Churches, in such sort as it is maintained by the Defendant, is inconsistent with that power which they have in themselves; as hath been shewed (y) before out of other places of the same Authours, according to which the place here quoted must be explained; where they speak onely of the Apostles times, and of particular Congregations considered in themselves, without excluding their confederacy with others, for their mutuall help in judging and deciding of causes.

(v) Cent. 1. 2. c. 4. p. 391.

(x) Pag. 30. 156, 157. 164, &c.

(y) P. 173. 174. 179.

I. C. *So again, for a hundred yeares next after; we read in Eusebius* (z), *Irænæus* (a), *Nicephorus* (b), *and others, that neighbour Ministers came often together, when there was any dangerous errour broached, or weighty points to be determined, serving for generall good: but this they did of liberty, not of duety; partly* to preserve mutuall society; as Zipperus (c) *sayth, or partly that they might hereby be the more able, to resist adversaries as*, Mr Parker (d) *sayth.* Answv. His quotations here, as they use to be, are either misprinted or impertinent: howbeit the things themselves for which they are alledged, may easily be granted. But the question is, whether the Synods or meetings of Ministers, held in that age did not exercise Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction in determining of weighty points, and deciding of controversies. If so be they did,

(z) L. 3. c. 22. L. 5. c. 16. L. 3. c. 19.
(a) L. 3. c. 1. 2. 3.
(b) L. 4. c. 23.
(c) L. 3. c. 7.
(d) Eccl. Pol. p. 329. 330.

did, which cannot be denyed, seeing (as hath been noted against the Arminians) *such a deciding of Ecclesiasticall controverſies was used in all the Synods of the ancient Orthodox Church*: then it muſt needs follow that thoſe times have given teſtimony unto ſuch Synods as are here maintained. But to avoyd this Concluſion, Mr C. puts in this ſhift, which we muſt take upon his owne credit, ſaying, *this they did of liberty, not of duety*. But to what purpoſe is this evaſion? 1. The oppoſing of dangerous errours, the preſerving of mutuall ſociety, and ſeeking help for the reſiſting of adverſaries, the things here ſpoken of, are neceſſary dueties; and therefore to be done of duety, and not of liberty. Men are bound to the performance itſelf, though there may be liberty uſed in the choyce of the circumſtances. 11. Mr Parker ſaith expreſſely in the very place here cited by Mr C. that (f) the ground of the combination of Churches is *the duety of maintaining mutuall ſociety, &c.* and *that bond of mutuall help which Moſes mentioneth Num. 32. 6.* where the Reubenites and Gadites are urged to their duety, not left to their liberty.

(e) Prof. Leyd. Cenſur. Confeſ. Remonſtr. Preſ. § 14. Vedel. de Arcan. Armin. l. 2. c. 6. p. 186.

See before, p. 78.

(f) De Pol. Eccl. l. 3. p. 329.

In the next place he telles us his opinion touching the limits of Synodall actions, to wit, that (g) Eccleſiaſticall Officers may *conclude what they judge meet & good*, but not make a *Church-act or ſentence, unleſſe the Church firſt know it, & give their free conſent unto it*. As if to any effectuall purpoſe weighty points could be determined, mutuall ſociety preſerved, and adverſaries reſiſted, when dangerous errours are broched (which are the reaſons he himſelf hath allowed for aſſembling in Synods,) while every Church is left free to itſelf, to approve or reject what is ſo concluded. His reaſon is, *becauſe the power & authoritie to make Church-acts is in the body of the Congregation*. The proofe hereof, as it is underſtood & applyed by him, is yet to be expected. Comming downe to the next hundred yeares, he ſeemes to acknowledge the practiſe of thoſe times to be againſt him: but to excuſe the matter, he alledgeth *Caſaubon, D. Whitaker, Mornæus, Brightman*, yea and *Cyprian, Euſebius*, and *Ambroſe*, teſtifying that in thoſe times *men began to deviſe a new order and manner of governing Churches, &c.* Obſerve here a notable fallacy, in his inſinuating that to be the cauſe of ſuch ſpeeches which indeed was not. It is true that theſe and other Authours have complained of changes and corruptions crept into the Church in thoſe times; but not becauſe of Synodall authority then exerciſed: nay this hath ever been accounted the happines of thoſe times, that the Churches had more liberty to aſſemble in Synods, then they could have before, in the times of perſecution under Heathen Emperours. *Conſtantine* is every where commended for his religious reſpect unto the welfare of the Church in aſſembling the Synod of *Nice*. On the other ſide the wickednes of *Licinius* is noted by his forbidding the uſe of ſuch Aſſemblies. Though Epiſcopall dignity grew to a greater height in thoſe times then before, yet Synodall juriſdiction was the ſame that had been uſed formerly, ſave onely that the favour of the Emperours, publick liberty, and the increaſe of offences together with the inlargement of the Churches are (h) obſerved to have made the Aſſemblies more generall and frequent then in former ages. And therefore whatſoever Mr C. *affirme*, there is no reaſon why we ſhould diſſent from what was before (i) alledged out of D. F. whom he had cited for his witneſſe, who ſpeaking of the authoritie of Synodes, ſayth, *Which*

(g) Ch. pl. p. 95.

(h) Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 10. c. 3. Iun. Animadv. in Bellarm. de Concil. l. 1. c. 10. n. 2. Camerar. Hiſt. Syn. Nic. p. 212. edit. Niceph.

(i) P. 204.

Which authoritie we know to be granted to the Church by our Saviour Christ; practised by his Apostles; cõtinued by their succeſſours 300 yeares, before there were any Chriſtian Emperours.

Afterwards falling againe to the point of Popular Government, he ſayth, (k) *Mr Beza is very ſtreyt to the people, hardly granting the liberty which the very Ieſuits doe:* he ſhould have ſhewed wherein; for the Ieſuites are knowne to (l) expound the word *Church* by *Prelates*, in the place whereunto he ſends us in *Maldonate*. To evince the late riſing of Preſbyteriall authoritie in elections, he argueth from the 13th Canon of the Synod of Laodicea, mentioned (m) by *Beza*, where it was ordered that the election of Miniſters ſhould *not be permitted to the multitude or people*. but 1. He doth not rightly interpret the Canon, when he ſaith that *this Synod prohibited the body of the Congregation, from uſing that liberty and power, which they before alwayes had in Eccleſiaſticall government*. For as *Beza* ſaith in the place by him quoted, the manner of election here forbidden was not *eſſentiall* but *accidentall*: *Chemnitius* alſo (n) ſhewes that the people were not thereby excluded from the election, but that their conſent was ſtill required; that this Synodall decree was occaſioned by the peoples *abuſing their right unto tumults, ſeditions and diverſe confuſions*. 2. By a like inference he might conclude that other erroneous opinions and diſordered practiſes, condemned in the Councils and Synods of thoſe times, were before allowed and uſed in the Church.

(k) Ch. pl. P. 95.
(l) Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, l. 3. c. 5. Mariana & Em. Sa, in Mat. 18. 17.
(m) Reſpõſi. ad Tract. de Miniſtr. Evang. grad. c. 22. p. 154, 155.
(n) Exam. Concil. Trident. par. 1. p. 411, 412. ed. 1606.

III. THat which he pretends to anſwer in the third place, is taken from this expreſſion which the Authour uſed in his Preface, ſaying, *That which ſome will have to be* the ſlavery & bondage *of a Church, that I eſteeme to be the liberty, ſafety and preſervation of Churches. That which they count* a Tyrannicall government, *that I believe to be a Sanctuary againſt Tyranny*. and afterwards in the book itſelf, (o) *If I ſhould in doctrine oppugne, and in practiſe deny unto the members of this Church, this liberty of appeale unto the Claſſis, as they doe here condemne it in me, then might they juſtly complaine of tyrannicall government and corrupt doctrine, then had they cauſe to bewayle their ſlavery and bondage.* Thus he declared his judgement touching the benefit of this kinde of government in oppoſition to the Title prefixed unto the printed Complaints, which Mr C. knew beſt who framed. The matter of Argument couched in theſe words is ſufficiently explained and vindicated (p) before, where the libertie of Appeales, ſuitable to common equity, and inſtituted in the Law, is prooved to be agreeable unto the doctrine of the Goſpel.

(o) Pag. 83.
(p) P. 36--41.

I. C. ANSVV. 1. *It is a ſtrange courſe, when there ariſeth a controverſy touching two contrary opinons, which of them is true, & to be embraced; to draw the reſolution hereof, to the conſideration of the uſefulnes of the opinions, or practiſes queſtioned. As if becauſe a thing is uſefull, therefore it is to be concluded it is true: &c.* REPL. 1. It is ſtrange Mr C. did not diſcerne, that there is no other courſe of reaſoning in the Authours holding Claſſicall government to be a *Sanctuary againſt Tyranny*, & the denyall of Appeales a matter of *ſlavery & bondage*; then in Mr Cannes & others, accounting Independency to be the *libertie & freedome of a Church*, & ſubjection to Claſſicall government *ſlavery & bondage*. What is here ſayd unto the one, may as fitly be applyed againſt the other. If his anſwer be ſound, he doth plainely overthrow his owne (q) Arguments, built upon the ſame foundation which here he ſeeks to deſtroy. There was no

(q) Ch. pl. P. 71. & 76. Arg. 9. & Reaſ. 7.

uſefulnes

uſefulnes mentioned in the Authours words, nor any other to be underſtood, then ſuch as is implyed in the ſayd & other the like expreſſions and reaſonings of Mr C.

11. Though it be certaine that every trueth of God is uſefull, & to be uſed without gainſaying, when it appeareth to be ſuch; yet when this trueth is denyed, and the point controverted, it is no ſtrange courſe to proove it to be law by the agreement which it hath with that which is confeſſed to be law. This the Authour hath done in the place above mentioned. And beſides, ſeeing according to that * law of lawes commonly received, *the ſafetie of the people is the higheſt law*; and that Appeales are (r) *for the relief of the oppreſſed*, and a remedy againſt wrongs & injuries; why may we not conclude that ſuch a government where they are in due manner admitted, is *a Sanctuarie againſt Tyranny*, and in this reſpect rather to be embraced then Independency, where the ſame are denyed?

* Salus populi ſuprema lex eſto.

(r) Luth. Tom. 1. f. 231.

I. C. Ansvv. II. *The Papiſts and Hierarchie for their Diſcipline give the very ſame reaſon; viz. that there may be no Tyranny and oppreſſion among brethren, &c.* Repl. And ſo doth Mr C. for Independencie, (ſ) that a particular Congregation may not of *a Miſtres become a ſervant; inſtead of being a ſuperiour wilfully vaſſall & enſlave herſelf, &c.*

(ſ) Ch. pl. p. 76.

I. C. Ansvv. III. *I doe deny that this government by Claſſes & Synods ſerves better for the Churches welfare, then that which the Apoſtles inſtituted, &c.* Repl. And ſo wil we, when he hath prooved that Independency is the government inſtituted by the Apoſtles.

I. C. Ansvv. IV. *If it ſhould be granted that particular Congregations by this kinde of government, ſhall have peace, profit, credit & other worldly reſpects: yet this is no ſufficient reaſon, &c.* Repl. The Defendant never uſed ſuch a reaſon: this is a ſkarrecrow of his owne ſetting up, and therefore we muſt give him leave to pleaſe himſelf in that ſivefold ſhot which he makes at it.

IV. The fourth reaſon which he ſuppoſeth he hath found in the Authours book, is the mention which he made of the *determinations of Nationall Synods* concerning the power exerciſed by the Claſſis, and the conſent of *all Reformed Churches*. Hereunto he anſwers, I. *Councils may erre, &c.* II. *Theſe teſtimonies are all humaine, &c.* III. *This reaſon is the ſame which the Papiſts uſe, &c.* Repl. 1. The Decrees of Synods were not alledged to proove the lawfulnes of this government, but to ſhew the eſtabliſhed exerciſe of it before the Author either knew the Claſſis or they him, & that therefore he hath not ſubjected the Church to this power. 11. Though Coũcils may erre, yet it doth not therfore follow that they do alwayes erre & that they may not make decrees for the deciding of controverſies, as *Vedelius* (t) ſheweth againſt the Arminians. 111. Though the decrees of Synods have no abſolute authority, yet being framed according to the word of God, they doe ſpecially binde the Churches that are in combination with them: as when a Church-act or ſentence is made ſo as Mr C. would have it, he will not deny but that the Congregation is bound to obſerve it. The other exceptions here added are already anſwered.

(t) De Arcan. Armin. l. 2. c. 6. p. 183, 184.

V. In the next place he undertakes to anſwer what was objected touching the long continuance of that which ſome of later times onely did complaine of. Here Mr C. brings in W. B. pretending ignorance of the former ſtate of that Cogregation, yet in ſuch termes as might hide the point in queſtion from the inconſiderate Reader. But not to ſpeak of what hath been frequently noted before, the colour

given to this pretẽce, which W. B. probably never dreamed of till it was ſuggeſted by Mr C. is when he makes him ſay, *The thing ſpecially, which induced me ſo to thinke was his owne words, written to Mr Ainſworth; reporting how he was firſt made our Miniſter: hee ſaith*, (v) The Dutch Elderſhip in this City being deſired, both for their counſell & help in his ordination; deputed three of their brethren to aſſiſt us in this buſineſſe, &c. this they did not as aſſuming authoritie * to themſelves over us: but in our name, & by our requeſt, &c. *If the Claſſis aſſumed not then any authority unto themſelves over us, how comes it to paſſe that they doe it now? Or how will it hang together, that their power is ancient; and yet 20 or 30 yeares paſt, they uſed it not. This to me ſeemes groſſe contradiction, &c.* REPL. This his conceit of a groſſe contradiction, which he is ſo taken with that he ſpends almoſt a whole page of his Rhetorick upon it, is no better then a groſſe miſtake of his owne, which he hath blindely runne into by not diſcerning betwixt things that differ. 1. He confounds theſe two things as if they were one & the ſame, viz. the *Dutch Elderſhip* of that city, & the *Claſſis*; which being two diſtinct aſſemblies, there can be no contradiction in affirming that of the one which is denyed of the other. The Dutch Elderſhip is not the Claſſis, no more then the Engliſh Elderſhip of the ſame city. They are both members of the Claſſis, together with other Congregations of the neighbour townes & villages. Now the Elderſhips of particular Churches are not ſubject one to another, neither doth one exerciſe authority over another, as hath been ſhewed (x) before. It is the Claſſis, or combination of more Churches or Elderſhips, ſending their Deputies thither, to whom is aſcribed the power of determining the matters of particular Congregations. And this is ſo evident that if Mr C. had but conſulted hereabout with W. B. in whoſe name he pleades on this manner, he might have been ſufficiently informed of this trueth. Yea he might eaſily have learnt it out of the Authours former book, where he ſaith of the ſame Dutch Conſiſtory, (y) *Though they had no power to judge & determine the matter by their ſentence, yet they refuſed not to giue their counſell &c.* 11. Though it had been ſpokẽ of the Claſſis, which was ſayd of the Dutch Conſiſtory, yet there had been no contradiction in the Authors words, ſaying that *they aſſumed no authority to themſelves over them in his Ordination*, & yet avouching that the power which they exerciſed of later times, is the ſame which they had & practiſed long before. for 1. The power which the Claſſis exerciſeth, is not by them *aſſumed*, but given unto them & acknowledged to be their due by the Congregations that either at firſt or afterwards enter into this confederacy for the ſubmitting of themſelves unto ſuch an aſſembly in all requiſite caſes. 2. The orders according to which the Claſſes doe here exerciſe their authority, (z) doe not in ordinary caſes require the manifeſtation thereof in the Ordination of Miniſters; which being onely (a) *the ſolemne introduction of the Miniſter already choſen into the free exerciſe of his function*, the Claſſis doth leave it to the Congregation itſelf, after they have conſented to the choyce of the Miniſter. 3. When a Congregation deſtitute of fit men for the ſolemniſing of an Ordination doth ſeek unto a neighbour Claſſis, Conſiſtory, or Miniſter, for their counſel & help herein; they that in ſuch caſes doe yeeld unto their deſire, doe not exerciſe authority over that Congregation where the Miniſter is ordained: ſeeing they per-

(v) Arrow ag. Separ. p. 116.

* Note.

(x) Pag. 29, 30, & 159.

(y) Anſw. to W. B. p. 70, 71.

(z) Kercke-Orden. Nat. Syn. Dordr. Art. 4.

(a) Amef. Medul. l. 1. c. 39. th. 34.

performe that work in the name & at the requeſt of the ſayd Congregatiõ. Whatſoever power & authoritie is therein exerciſed by a neighbour Miniſter, is not by him *aſſumed*, but *received from the deſire of thoſe that ſeek his help*, for the performance of this ſervice unto them in a time of need, as the Authour had before explained himſelf in the (b) ſame book. And therefore he hath herein no way contradicted himſelf, neither can this excuſe W. B. from that which was objected unto him. (b) Arrow ag. Separ. p. 111, 112, 114.

But by the concluſion of this plea it ſeemes Mr C. did not ſo much intend thereby the defence of his client, as the caſting of ſome diſgrace upon the Authours book, called *An Arrow againſt the Separation of the Browniſts*, which he loves to have a fling at upon all occaſions: but his beating of the aire is apparent to thoſe that obſerve his blowes, & mark where they light. From what is now ſaid it is manifeſt how vainely he hath here applyed againſt the ſaid book, what the Author had ſayd touching *Mr Robinſons Iuſtification of Separation*, viz. that it was *ſick of King Iehorams incurable diſeaſe, &c.* which Mr C. himſelf hath (c) elſwhere in his wonted language, acknowledged to be true. But to haſten to an end, & to oppoſe ſomewhat unto this cenſorious & the forementioned ſlanderous concluſion of Mr C. that the Reader may partly underſtand what entertainment that *Arrow againſt the Separation* hath had among the godly learned, & what they have judged of the Authors paines therein; I have here ſet downe the teſtimony of that worthy ſervant of Chriſt, *Mr Hy.* as it was written by himſelf to the Authour in theſe words. *I thanke you for the Arrow of your owne Quiver, which now of late I have received, according to your letter. You have faſhioned & feathered it ſo well, headed & poynted it with ſuch diligence & care, drawne it up to the head with ſuch ſtrength, directed & diſcharged it with ſuch & ſo ſure ayme & ſkill, that it hath pierced, not onely the head, but the heart of the Browniſts cauſe, & Rabbines fancyes & forgeries; wherein I profeſſe you have given me better ſatiſfaction both of your owne ſufficiency for polemicall imployments in the Lords ſervice (whereof notwithſtanding I ever held a very good opinion) & of the weakneſſe & vanity of all their forces & fortreſſes, raiſed & advanced againſt either Gods Church, or Gods word, then hitherto I ever had, or could ever by any thing that I have heard or ſeene, attaine unto. Which if I might not ſpeake as truely, as freely; or did not thinke as unfainedly, as I write it willingly, I ſhould feare this might ſavour of ſome ſpice of flattery, which I hate, & (I know) you neither love, nor looke for at my hand.* The ſubſtance of this his judicious & unpartiall approbation, hath been confirmed by ſundry others, in like manner eminent for learning & piety, & ſhall doubtles be further verifyed hereafter, according to His gracious diſpoſing, who hath ſayd, * *The memory of the juſt is bleſſed:* and, *The righteous ſhall be in everlaſting remembrance.* (c) Stay againſt ſtraying, p. 142. Frõ Bunb. Iul. 8. 1619. *Prov. 10. 7. Pſal. 112. 6.

The

The Contentes of
THE FIRST PART,
Touching a Particular Eldership.

CHAP. PAG.

I. *The occasion of this writing, and the State of the Question.* 1.

II. *Arguments to prove the power of the Eldership in judging, and ending some causes without the knowledge of the Congregation.* 2.

III. *A Refutation of sundry Errours, whereupō Mr Ainsworth grounds their Popular Government.* 7.

IV. *Whether the people be bound to be present at the proceedings against offendours.* 19.

THE SECOND PART.
Touching Classes and Synods.

I. *The State of the Question, and the importance thereof.* 29.

II. *The first Argument, taken from the words of the Law, Deut. 17. 8–12.* 34.

III. *The second Argument, taken from the words of Christ, Matth. 18. 15–20.* 42.

IV. *The third Argument, takē from the practise of the primitive Churches, in the Apostles times.* 61.

Mr Dav. his Exceptions touching Act. 15. answered. 66.

Mr Cawnes Exceptions touching Act. 15. answered. 68.

V. *An Answer to the Allegations of Mr Davenport, touching the Authority of Synods.*

SECT. I. *His Allegation of Mr Cartwright answered.* 81.

II. *His Allegation of Mr Fenner examined.* 84.

III. *His Allegation of Mr Parker examined.* 88.

IV. *His Allegation of Dr Amesius examined.* 106.

V. *His Allegation of Mr Baynes examined.* 111.

VI. *His Allegation of the Replie upon Dr Downams examined.* 116.

VII. *His Allegation of Dr Vorstius examined.* 118.

VIII. *Touching the English Church at Francford in Q. Maries time.* 121.

IX. *Mr Dav. his pretence of agreement with Iunius examined.* 125.

X. *His pretence of agreement with Dr Whitaker examined.* 133.

XI. *His Allegation of Chamierus examined.* 141.

VI. *An Answer to Mr Cawnes Arguments.* 145.

VII. *The Allegations of Mr Cawne examined.* 168.

SECT. I. *Touching the Testimonies of Papists.* 169.

II. *The Testimonies of Lutherans.* 173.

III. *The Testimonies of Calvinists.* 184.

IV. *The Testimonies of English Conformists.* 196.

V. *The Testimonies of English Non-Conformists.* 200.

VI. *The Testimonies of ancient Fathers, Councels, and Emperours.* 213.

VII. *The Testimonies of Reformed Churches.* 227.

A Supplement, for answer unto that which followeth in Mr Cawnes book, touching the evill consequents of Independency, the Antiquity of Classes and Synods, &c. 240.

FINIS.

TWO

LETTERS

The one being sent to the Lord Bishop of *Peterborough*.

The other sent from the Bishop of *Bangor*, to the Ministers of his Diocesse.

VVherein is discovered the readines of the ill-affected Clergy, toward the furnishing of his Majesty with moneys for the mayntaining of Warre against his Parliament.

Ordered by the Lords and Commons in Parliament, That these bee forthwith printed and published.

Hen. Elsinge, Cler. Parl. D. Com.

LONDON,

Printed for *Ed. Husbands*, and *John Francke*, and are to be sold at the Kings head in Fleetstreet, 1642.